THE

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

No. 46.] *OCTOBER*, 1805. [No. 10. Vol. IV.

Religious Communications.

SKETCHES OF THE REFORMATION, NO. VII.

IN my last I laid before your readers a short view of the opinions expressed on the subject of Predestination, in the publicly authorized writings of the reign of Edward VI. The next document to which, in pursuing this inquiry, I would direct their attention is the Bible, commonly called "the Bishop's Bible," which appeared in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. It will, however, be proper, before I proceed, to give some account of the circumstances which attended its publication.

"Among the noble designs of Archbishop Parker," observes the indefatigable Strype, "must be reckoned his resolution to have the Holy Bible set forth well translated into the vulgar tongue."—"And he had about this time (1565) distributed the Bible, divided into parts, to divers his learned fellow Bishops, and to some other divines that were about him, who cheerfully undertook the work." The Archbishop sent "withal his instructions for the method they should observe; and they to add some short marginal notes for the illustration or correction of the text. And all these portions of the Bible being finished, and sent back to the Archbishop, he was to add the last hand to them, and so take care for printing and publishing the whole." *Strype's Parker*, p. 207, 208.

This Bible was first published with the royal sanction in 1568, and was called *the Bishop's Bible*, "because the Archbishop and the Bishops had the chief hand in correcting, reviewing, and publishing it."—*Strype's Parker*, p. 272. Of this Bible a second edition, corrected, amended, and improved, was printed in folio in the year 1572, a copy of which is now before me. Prefixed to it is a preface written by Archbishop Parker, the same which is inserted in the Appendix to Strype's Life of that Prelate, No. 83. Before the New Testament is another preface written by the same hand, and of which a correct copy will be found No. 84 of the same Appendix. From these Prefaces I shall give a few extracts.

"They," the Scriptures, "concern all of what nation, of what tongue, of what profession soever any man be. For to all belongeth it to be called unto eternal life, so many as by the witness of the Scripture desire to find eternal life. No man, woman, or child, is excluded from this salvation; and, therefore, to every of them is this spoken," "*search ye the Scriptures*, whereby ye may find eternal life."—"For he that hath care of all, he accepteth no man's person: his will is that all men should be saved; his will is that all should come to the way of truth."—"Only search with an humble spirit, ask in continual prayer, seek with purity of life, knock with perpetual perseverance, and cry to that good spirit of Christ the comforter. And surely to every such asker it will be given, such searchers must needs find, to them it will be opened. Christ himself will open the sense of the Scriptures, not to the proud, or to the wise of the world, but to the lowly and contrite in heart."—"To find Christ as their Saviour; to cleave to his salvation and merits; to be brought to the low repentance of their lives, and to amend themselves; to raise up their faith to our Saviour Christ; so to think of him as the Scriptures do testify of him: these be the principal causes why Christ did send the Jews to search the Scriptures." Archbishop Parker's Preface to the Old Testament.

"The law was given by Moses, but grace and verity came by Jesus Christ, which grace this book of the New Testament doth most evidently commend and set out. In this is discovered the whole mystery of our

salvation and redemption purchased by our Saviour Christ."—"These be the mysteries of our faith, these be the grounds of our salvation: these be thus written, that we should believe them, and by our belief should enjoy life everlasting."—"This is the last prophet to be looked for to speak unto us. In him be universally inclosed the riches and treasures of the wisdom and knowledge of God his Father. By him hath he decreed finally to judge the whole world, the living and the dead. By him hath he decreed to give to his elect the life everlasting; and to the reprobate, who hath contemned his life and doctrine, death everlasting."—"Here may we behold the eternal legacies of the New Testament, bequeathed from God the Father in Christ his Son to all his electes."—"Let us now, good Christian people, rejoice in these glad tidings, expressed unto us by the name of the Gospel of our Saviour Christ: and let it never fall out of our remembrance, that we were sometime overwhelmed in darkness and set in the shadow of death. Let us consider that we were sometime, by our natural birth, the children of God's wrath, and wholly estranged from the houshold of God."—"If we be now the children of light, let us walk in this our light in all holiness and godliness of life, approving that which is pleasing to the Lord. Let us have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness."—"Let us follow the truth in love and charity, and in all things grow up unto him which is the head, that is, Christ our Saviour. If we be now the children of grace, and made lively members of his body, though sometime strangers and foreigners far off, and made near by the blood of Christ, and made citizens with the saints and of the houshold of God: let us direct our hearts thither, where our head is, delighting ourselves in all heavenly cogitations, walking in all spiritual works, and fruits of the spirit, as God's dear elect. God grant that Christ may so dwell in our hearts by faith, that we may be able to comprehend with all saints the unspeakable love of Christ, which passeth all men's knowledge." Archbishop Parker's Preface to the New Testament.

Having thus given a view of the circumstances which attended the publication of *the Bishop's Bible*, and exemplified, by extracts from the Prefaces, the spirit and sentiments of the chief promoter of that work, it is time that I should return, to what is the main purpose of the present paper, the illustrating, by a reference to this Bible, the opinions of our Reformers respecting Predestination and Election. The extracts already given from the Prefaces will serve to throw some light on this subject. But, besides these, the Bible in question contains a number of notes added by the translators, and revised by the Archbishop. Of these I have selected such as seem to have any relation to the point in hand, which I submit entirely to the judgment of the reader, without presuming to interpose any comment of my own. The extracts which follow are all taken verbatim from the Bishop's Bible, the sacred text being distinguished from the remarks of the annotators, by being printed in the italic character.

Genes. xii. 1. "*I am the Almighty God, &c.*"—"God freely chooseth his, that they should be holy and without hypocrisy before him."

Genes. xxviii. 15. "*I will not leave thee.*"—"God taketh all the charge of his elect, and never forsaketh them."

Exod. vii. 3. "*I will harden Pharaoh's heart.*"—"God was no cause of Pharaoh's sin, though he executed this just judgment upon him."

Exod. xxxii. 32. "*Wipe me, I pray thee, out of thy book.*"—"Out of the number of them that be elect and predestinate to life everlasting."

Ver. 33. "*I will put him out of my book that hath sinned against me,*" (i. e.) "I will make it known that he was never any of the elect."

Deut. xxx. 19. "*Therefore chuse life.*"—"That is to say, shew thy love and obedience to God, which is not performed by our own strength, but by God's grace working in his elect."

2 Kings iii. 14. "*And it were not that I regard the presence of Jehosaphat, I would not look towards thee nor see thee.*"—"God suffereth his word to be declared to the wicked because of the godly that are among them."

Psalm cx. 3. "*Thy people will be very willing, &c.*"—"Christ and his holy word shall be received of his elect most willingly."

Malachi i. 2. "*Was not Esau Jacob's brother, yet loved I Jacob.*"—"In our election is God's great love to us ward declared."

Luke xix. 9. "*Because that he is also the child of Abraham.*"—"To be the child of Abraham is to be freely elect, Rom. xi.; and to continue in the steps of Abraham's faith, Rom. iv.; and to do the works of Abraham, John viii."

John xvii. 9. "*I pray not for the world.*"—"That is, the reprobate that seek the world and not Christ."

Rom. ix. Contents ver. 11. "Paul treateth of election and reprobation."

Rom. ix. 11. "*That the purpose of God by election might stand.*"—"The will and purpose of God is the cause of the election and reprobation: for his mercy and calling through Christ are the means of salvation, and the withdrawing of his mercy is the cause of damnation."

Rom. xi. 35. "*Either who hath given unto him first, and he shall be recompensed again.*"—"By this the Apostle declareth, that God by his free-will and election doth give salvation unto men without any desert of their own."

1 Cor. ix. 27. "*But I tame my body, and bring it into subjection; lest by any means that when I have preached to others I myself should be a castaway,*" (i. e.) "lest he should be reproved of men, when they should see him do contrary or contemn that thing which he taught others to do."

Ephes. i. Contents ver. 4. "St. Paul sheweth that the chief cause of their salvation standeth in the free election of God through Christ."

Ephes. i. 5. "*Who hath predestinated us into the adoption of children.*"—"Whereas we were not the natural children, he received us by grace and made us his children."

Coloss. i. 26. "*But now is opened to his saints,*" viz. "whom he hath elected and consecrated to him by Christ."

1 Thess. i. 6. "*Having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost.*"—"To believe and be fully persuaded to have the gifts of the Holy Ghost, and joyfully to suffer for Christ's sake, are most certain signs of our election."

2 Tim. ii. 19. "*But the strong foundation of God standeth still,* &c."—"He groundeth on God's election and man's faith."

2 Tim. iv. 4. "*The Lord reward him,*" Alexander the coppersmith, "*according to his deeds.*"—"Paul saw in him manifest signs of reprobation."

James i. 17. "*Every good giving, and every perfect gift, is from above.*"—"Seeing all good things come of God, we ought not to make him the author of evil."

1 Pet. i. Contents. "Peter sheweth that through the abundant mercy of God we are elect, and regenerate to a lively hope."

1 Pet. i. 2. "*Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father.*"—"The free election of God is the efficient cause of our salvation: the material cause is Christ's obedience: our effectual calling is the formal cause: and the final cause is our sanctification."

2 Pet. i. 3. "*According as his godly power hath given unto us all things,* &c."—"The sum of our salvation and religion is to be led by Christ to the Father, who calleth us in the Son."

2 Pet. i. 10. "*Give the more diligence to make your calling and election sure.*"—"Albeit it be sure in itself, for as much as God cannot change; yet we must confirm it in ourselves by the fruits of the spirit, knowing that the purpose of God electeth, calleth, sanctifieth, and justifieth us."

Q.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

In the Christian Observer for August 1804, there appeared a well written paper on Rom. iii. 25. with the signature W. H. In answer to which, in the number for October, was inserted a letter signed Αφιλος, animadverting upon the correction of our present translation suggested by W. H. It is on the latter of these productions that I beg leave to offer a few remarks.

In the first place let me assure you, that I conceive myself to agree with Αφιλος in religious sentiment, and am therefore far from regarding him with any degree of animosity. Αφιλος is unknown to me both as a scholar and as a man, there is, therefore, no ground either for contempt of his attainments or for personal enmity: and I trust he will consider the liberties taken with his paper, as arising from no other motive than an anxiety to assert its true meaning to a very

important passage of Scripture. The translation proposed by W. H. is as follows:—"For a demonstration of his righteousness, because of the passing by of sins committed in former periods of time, through the forbearance of God." A.'s first objection against this rendering of the passage respects "*the change of declare to demonstrate*," W. H. says *demonstration*, which being a noun is nearer the original. The correction seems sound, and is supported by the authority of Passor and Leigh; but as the main question is not affected by it I am willing to dispense with it as needless, nor is it one of the three particulars in which W. H. supposes the translation to fail. The next objection is more material. "The expression, η δικαιοσυνη αυτου, his righteousness," says Αφεσις, "does not mean, as I apprehend, 'the righteousness of his laws, the justice of his government, and his own immaculate purity'." W. H. tells us that, as he apprehends, this is the meaning; and the arguments by which he supports his opinion ought, in justice, to be admitted till they are confuted by stronger considerations.

W. H. observes, "our minds are struck with reverential fear when we contemplate *the judgments of war, of famine, and of pestilence; the overwhelming earthquakes, and the devouring fire from heaven*, ought strongly to impress us with a sense of the evil of sin." There is something unfair in adopting these expressions, and remarking that it is not very obvious how the judgments of war, &c. can speak forbearance. W. H. says no such thing; he says that, till the death of Christ, no adequate manifestation was given of the evil of sin: these judgments, it is admitted, were some indications of God's displeasure; but as God, upon the whole, did men good, giving them food from heaven and fruitful seasons, the period referred to must be considered as a period of forbearance in which the holiness and justice of God were not fully manifested.

"Passing by or passing over," says Αφεσις, "ought, in accurate theology, to signify the same as remission or forgiveness; for it cannot be intended to maintain the forbearance of God in the sense of connivance without regard to mediation." That there may be connivance where we cannot infer forgiveness is evident from the Apostle's words, "the times of this ignorance God winked at" (Acts xvii. 30.), nor does W. H. drop a single expression which can induce the suspicion, that he considered this forbearance as unconnected with the mediation; nay, his argument supposes the mediation to be connected with the forbearance, though not in such a way as to make forbearance and forgiveness the same thing; it is the mediation which explains the forbearance, *that* being revealed, the cloud which shaded the divine proceedings is done away, and the righteousness of God is demonstrated.

Αφεσις adds, that the word "Παρεσις does not appear to him properly to signify passing by or passing over, but as properly remission or forgiveness as any other term in the Scriptures." If so, it is remarkable that the passage under consideration should be the only place where it is used to express an idea which occurs so frequently; to Locke and Taylor it appeared so properly to signify passing over, that they have both rendered it by that phrase. Hammond also in his note in loc., "because of the passing by (not taking notice of) past sins." Taylor has also rendered δια *in relation to*; respecting which proposition I would remark, that its primary signification is *through*; that, with a genitive, it generally signifies *through, as an instrument*, or *by means of*; with an accusative, *through, as an occasion*, or *on account of;* but never, I believe, does it signify *in order to*. In Rom. iv. 25. it may appear to have that meaning, but the passage is capable of a different, and perhaps better, interpretation: δια, in the passage before us, is translated in the vulgate, *propter* on account of. Αφεσις has taken no notice whatever of W. H.'s remarks on the word προγεγονοτων, they must, therefore, be considered as standing in full force.

I have already observed that Locke and Taylor, though by no means agreeing with W. H. in sentiment, have given the same sense of several material words. It is, perhaps, a circumstance unknown to W. H. himself, that the late Mr. Adam, of Wintringham, in his Commentary on the Romans, has precisely the interpretation which he recommends. It may

further be remarked, that, though the general body of commentators follow the common translation, yet their authority is not to be considered as opposite to the reading proposed. The fair presumption is not that they rejected it, but that it escaped their observation.

J. F.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

SIR,

I WISH to attempt a reply to your correspondent Titus on the subject of *a mitigated law*. I acknowledge myself to be one of those persons whom he describes, as "taking for granted that there exists no divine law," (*i. e.* no rule of moral conduct for man), "but what requires from its subject perfect, *i. e.* unsinning, obedience." The words inclosed in the parenthesis do not, indeed, form a part of the proposition as expressed by your correspondent; but I have introduced them, in order to define the nature of that law concerning which we are speaking. To maintain this proposition is, according to the reasoning of "Titus," to be involved on the horns of a most formidable dilemma: for he adds, "since it is evident that such a law cannot be *to a sinner* a rule of life, it follows (if there exists no mitigated law) that all men, as sinners, must be either condemned criminals, or lawless persons." I could have wished that, in this passage, it had been more accurately stated, whether by "all men as sinners," are meant *all men in their natural state*, or "all men *in a state of grace*." For if the former be intended, the difficulty will speedily be solved: since all men, in their natural state, *are* condemned criminals; "concluded under sin," "shut up under the law," "children of wrath." I presume, therefore, that it is the latter interpretation which is to be adopted, and that consequently your correspondent's argument will stand thus. "Since it is evident that a law, which requires perfect, *i. e.* unsinning, obedience, cannot be *to a sinner* a rule of life, it follows that the person who denies the existence of any divine law, but such as this, runs into one or other of the two following errors: either he represents all men in a state of grace to be *condemned criminals*, contrary to the assertion of St. Paul, that *there is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus*; or he describes them as *lawless persons*, in opposition to what the same Apostle, in another passage, declares, that they 'are not without law to God, but under the law to Christ'." Hence Titus infers the necessity of a mitigated law: and, doubtless, if his premises were sound, the conclusion would be just. But is he not aware, that he is raising his structure on ground which will not support it? Where, I would ask, is the *evidence* of his position, "that a law, which requires perfect unsinning obedience, cannot be to a sinner a rule of life?" To those, indeed, who controvert this position, he suggests, in a note, the consideration of the question, "whether a law, which is supposed to command sinless obedience, can also command *repentance*." To the argument intended to be conveyed by this suggestion, I would reply by asking, "And where was it ever implied that such a law *does* command repentance?" Repentance is enjoined, not by the law, but by the Gospel. The law knows nothing of repentance: commands it not: makes no provision for it: in its own nature admits not of it. Its language is, "*Do this and live.*"—"*In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.*". In what respect then does the consideration recommended bear on the point in question? How does it tend to shew, that a law, requiring perfect obedience, cannot be to a sinner a rule of life? Surely Titus cannot have confounded the idea of a rule of life, *i. e.* a rule by which the life is to be governed, with that of a rule by obedience to which life is to be obtained: and yet his reasoning would almost justify the supposition. That a *sinner* cannot obtain life by obedience to a law which requires sinless obedience, is a proposition fully evident. The very concession of his being a *sinner* implies the forfeiture of life under such a law. Therefore such a law cannot be to him a rule, by obeying which he may obtain life. But that the rule by which his life is to be governed, cannot, in its nature, be a perfect rule; that the standard to which, in all his actions, motives, tempers, and affections, he must labour to attain, cannot in itself be a perfect standard, is a proposition of a very different kind: a proposi-

ion, surely, not self-evident, not to be received on mere assertion, but to be maintained and substantiated by argument and proof. What may be the arguments which Titus would adduce in favour of his cause, I am unable to conjecture; but in opposition to them, and in confirmation of my own opinion, I shall state as briefly as I can the grounds on which I conclude that there "exists no rule of moral conduct for man, but what requires from him perfect, *i. e.* unsinning, obedience."

First.—It appears to me that the essential nature and infinite perfections of the Almighty forbid him to institute any defective or imperfect rule of moral duty. The law which he enacts must be the transcript of his own holy mind, and consequently must be holy. To suppose him the author of a law, which enjoins or admits only a partial obedience, is to strip him of his most glorious perfection, and to conceive of him as a God who can tolerate iniquity. It may, indeed, be said, that God cannot reasonably demand a more extensive obedience from his creatures than they are enabled to render; and that, therefore, he must in justice proportion the measure of the services required of them to the measure of their capacity and abilities. So far as physical or intellectual properties are concerned, I readily admit the force of his argument. God cannot require men to fly, because he has not furnished them with wings; neither can he exact from them the intuitive knowledge which an angel may possess, because he has not endowed them with it. But in services of a *moral* nature, I cannot perceive that the conclusion holds. I cannot perceive how any sinful deterioration in the creature can absolve him from a particle of that perfect moral obedience which he owes to the Creator. Are the fallen angels less bound to love and serve God with all their powers, in their present sinful condition than they were when they kept their first estate? Is the Almighty in justice obliged to lower his demand upon them to the level of their ability to answer it? In other words, because they have made themselves wholly incapable of rendering to him any holy obedience, is he therefore constrained to release them from all obligations to obey him? Was Adam less bound after his fall to love God with all his heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, than he was before it? To admit such a supposition is to introduce endless confusion; to destroy every fixed standard of moral duty; and, in fact, to imply that the more a man has by sin incapacitated himself for obeying God, the less obedience God requires, and must in justice require, of him. The way in which the point should be stated I take to be this. The law of God demands from men no other obedience, either more or less, than what his perfections and their obligations require them to pay; and such obedience must in its nature be perfect and unsinning.

Secondly.—I am confirmed in this opinion by what is positively written in the Scriptures on this point. I do not find, under a dispensation professedly made for man in his fallen and sinful state, any allowed abatement in the rule of moral conduct prescribed to him. When Christ came in the fulness of time to prepare the way for a more complete manifestation of the terms and nature of the covenant of grace, did he, on any occasion, say, that he came to relax the demands of the law, or to lower the standard of moral duty? On the contrary, at the very commencement of his ministry we find him expressly asserting, that he was "come not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it." And though, doubtless, in his assertion he alluded partly to that accomplishment which the types and shadows of the Ceremonial Law were about to receive through him, yet his subsequent discourse plainly shews, that what he here principally designed to state as one of the objects of his coming, was to deliver the moral law from those corrupt glosses and defective interpretations, which the carnal minds of men had put on it, and to restore it to its original purity, and to its extensive spiritual meaning. Did not all our Lord's preaching accord with this statement? When he pointed out the measure of our duty, did he say, that, in any respect, it fell short of loving God with *all* our heart, and our neighbour as ourselves? When he proposed to us a standard for our imitation, did he propose a defective standard; or one which would give the least countenance to a supposition that we were not to aim at an unsin-

ning obedience? "Be ye perfect, even as your father, which is in heaven, is perfect." Nay, is not the example of Christ himself set forth as the great pattern which his people are to follow? Are they not required to walk in his steps; to be conformed to his image; to have that mind which was in him? And surely it cannot be denied, but that this pattern is a perfect pattern.

These are briefly the grounds on which I conclude that there "exists no rule of moral conduct for man, even under a state of grace, but what requires from him unsinning obedience." And hence, in answer to the question which Titus in the conclusion of his letter states, "Has our Lord and Saviour, as mediator, no law appropriate to his kingdom, to which his people are amenable, and which, *by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost*, they are become capable of obeying?" I reply, if by the expression, "*capable of obeying*," is meant "*capable of rendering a perfect obedience*," that no such law exists: because, though the people of God are in part renewed unto holiness, and may daily be making further progress towards perfection, yet in the present life they never can attain to such a state as to be capable of *perfectly* obeying a divine rule of moral conduct. If by the expression, "*capable of obeying*," your correspondent will allow me to understand "*endowed with a disposition and desire to obey*," I answer to his question, "Yes." Such a law as he describes does exist in the mediatorial kingdom of Christ; the very law, of which I have been speaking throughout, the perfect moral law of God's universal empire. Of this law, however, it cannot, with strict propriety, be said that "the Lord's people are *amenable* to it." For in truth they are delivered from its *condemning* power. In the law written in their hearts they read an evidence of their union with Christ, and of their interest in his promises. In their cordial approbation of the holy and spiritual demands of the law, and in their continual prayers and exertions after a greater conformity to it, they perceive their qualification and meetness for future glory. But as to their actual obedience they see in it so much defectiveness, defilement, and sin, that they make no account of it. They put it altogether away as an unclean thing. Their comfort arises from the reflection, not of what *they* have done or can do, but of what Christ has done for them. Their language is, "Enter not into judgment with thy servants, O Lord. By grace we are saved through faith and not of works."

I hope what I have said may prove satisfactory to "Titus." If otherwise; should he take the trouble to state the points, in which I appear to him deficient, I will endeavour, in a subsequent communication, to express myself more clearly. DEFENSOR.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

COMPLAINTS of the age in which men live have at all times been common; and though occasionally overcharged, have been, for the most part, well-founded. In proof of this may be mentioned the coincidence which may sometimes be traced between the faults of one age and of another, or of one description of persons in it and of another. And though this circumstance is by no means favourable to the hope of progressive improvement, it may, notwithstanding, continue to be a motive to urge us to profit by the errors of those who have preceded us. These observations are intended to introduce to your readers an extract from Dr. Owen's Treatise on the Mortification of Sin in Believers; a book which I beg leave strongly to recommend to their perusal. The author had been stating the necessity of the duty of mortifying the deeds of the body, according to the doctrine of St. Paul. Rom. viii. 13. But before he proceeded further with the discussion of his subject, he was led to make the following complaint of the professed Christians of his day. It is somewhat severe; but, I fear, it was neither unjust nor uncharitable. How far the whole picture may fairly represent the characters of any persons professedly religious in the present day, I will not take upon me to determine. To exhibit it, however, may, at least, be profitable by way of warning, if not of reproof and correction.

"Before I proceed," says Dr. Owen, "to the consideration of the

next principle, I cannot but by the way *complain* of many *professors* of these days; who, instead of bringing forth such great and evident fruits of *mortification* as are expected, scarce bear any leaves of it. There is, indeed, a broad light fallen upon the men of this generation; and together therewith many *spiritual gifts communicated*, which, with some other considerations, have wonderfully enlarged the bounds of professors and profession; both they and it are exceedingly multiplied and increased. Hence there is a noise of religion and religious duties in every corner; preaching in abundance, and that not in an empty, light, trivial, and vain manner, as formerly, but to a good proportion of a spiritual gift; so that if you will measure the number of *believers* by light, gifts, and profession, the Church may have cause to say, "Who hath borne me all these?" But now if you will take the measure of them by this great discriminating grace of Christians, perhaps you will find their number not so multiplied. Where almost is that professor who owes his *conversion* to these days of light, and so talks and professes of such a rate of spirituality as few in former days were in any measure acquainted with, (I will not judge them, but perhaps boasting what the Lord hath done in them,) that doth not give evidence of a miserably unmortified heart? If vain spending of time, idleness, unprofitableness of men's places, envy, strife, variance, emulations, wrath, pride, worldliness, selfishness, (1 Cor. i.) be badges of Christians, we have them on us and amongst us in abundance: and if it be so with them who have so much light, and which we hope is saving, what shall we say of some who would be accounted religious, and yet despise Gospel light, and, for the duty we have in hand, know no more of it but what consists in men denying themselves sometimes in outward enjoyments, which is one of the utmost branches of it, which yet they will seldom practise! The good Lord send out a spirit of mortification to cure our distempers, or we are in a sad condition.

"There are two evils which certainly attend every unmortified professor. The first in himself, and the other in respect of others.

"1. In himself: let him pretend what he will, he hath slight thoughts of sin, at least of sins of daily infirmity. *The root of an unmortified course is the digestion of sin without bitterness in the heart.* When a man hath confirmed his imagination to such an apprehension of grace and mercy, as to be able without bitterness to swallow and digest daily sins, that man is at the very brink of turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and being hardened by the deceitfulness of sin."

"2. To others: it hath an evil influence on them, on a twofold account.

"1. It hardens them by begetting in them a persuasion, that they are in as good condition as the best professors. Whatever they see in them is so stained for want of this mortification, that it is of no value with them; they have zeal for religion, but it is accompanied with want of forbearance and universal righteousness: they deny prodigality, but with worldliness: they separate from the world, but live wholly to themselves; taking no care to exercise loving-kindness in the earth: they talk spiritually, and live vainly: mention communion with God, and are every way conformed to the world: boasting of forgiveness of sin, and never forgiving others: and with such considerations do poor creatures harden their hearts in their *unregeneracy*.

"2. They deceive them in making them believe, that if they can come up to *their* condition it shall be well with them; and so it grows an easy thing to have the great temptation of repute in religion to wrestle with: when they may go far beyond them, as to what appears in them, and yet come short of eternal life."

The foregoing extract, Mr. Editor, from Dr. Owen's Treatise, I leave to the serious consideration of your readers, only requesting, on the one hand, that no one will conclude, from the lamentable representation which it contains, that all inconsistent and unmortified Christians are hypocrites, and that it is in vain to look for a man of real piety and holiness; and earnestly exhorting, on the other, those who may be conscious that some traits in this dark portrait too nearly resemble their own, to "be zealous and repent," lest they be finally "hardened through the deceitfulness of sin."

C.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

SIR,

I LATELY paid a visit to a clergyman, who has for some years had the charge of a populous parish in my neighbourhood. He had been often mentioned to me as a faithful minister of Christ, and an amiable man, who, though commonly called a Methodist, was by no means a favourite with those who give themselves that title. He so seldom leaves his parish, that I had not happened to meet him, and was glad of the opportunity which a little business afforded me of becoming acquainted with him. I was received with great urbanity, and introduced into a very plain but neat parlour, where his wife was sitting with two of her daughters of the age of ten or twelve, whom she had evidently been instructing in needlework and reading. One of them had a half-finished pocket in her hands, and an open book on the table had evidently been just laid down by the other. I was struck by the unaffected cheerfulness in the countenances of both the mother and the daughters, and felt myself to be in a happy family. My business with the clergyman made it necessary that we should see two of his parishioners, and I proposed that, instead of sending for them, we should walk to their houses. To this he consented, after remarking that they lived at some distance from the parsonage, and in different parts of the village; and he engaged me to partake of his family dinner on our return. By this time I found that my companion was a man of no common sort. His conversation and demeanour were marked by good sense and kindness, and by the substance of politeness without any of its affectation or parade. There was an engaging simplicity and frankness about him, while his eye and the lines of his countenance were indicative of a cultivated understanding and chastised feelings. In walking with him round his parish, I was pleased to see the unaffected kindness with which he spoke to every one he met. It was as distant from the assumed airs of a person who thinks he must be *very* civil, as it was from the dignified condescension of conscious superiority. His parishioners, with one exception, received his salutations as those of a warm friend. In some instances, indeed, their kindness was evidently tempered with awe or shame, but even in those the good man maintained the same frank affability in his countenance and manner. I was particularly pleased with the glow of esteem and kindness which animated the face of a woman with a child in her arms. It was evident, that she thought herself under no common obligation to him. A sturdy butcher formed the exception to this general expression of respectful courtesy. He passed us with a swollen face and a gruff air, like a man who had far rather go to a bull-baiting than meet his minister. His manner was such a contrast to that of the other villagers we had met, that I could not help expressing my surprise. My companion smiled, and said that, through the divine blessing, the poor man who had passed us was almost the only one of his people who did not behave to him with kindness, though he had endeavoured to be faithful in the discharge of his duty, both in public and in private, to all of them, and of course had not only exhorted them to what is right, but had very frequently, not to say continually, been obliged to reprove them for what is sinful. "And reproof," said the good man, "is so bitter a draught, and is administered by all of us with so little skill, and with dispositions so far removed from those which shine forth in the example of our blessed Saviour, that I impute the little animosity, and the great attention and regard, which I meet with, to the signal kindness of him who has the hearts of all men in his hand." He then went on to say, that for a short time after he came to his parish the affection of his people had appeared to be universal, and he had fondly imagined that the sunshine would never be obscured by a cloud. However, when first salutations were over, and he proceeded to business; when his neighbours found him earnest in pointing out the evil of sin, and even in reproving them in private for their own individual faults; the face of things began to alter, and all his care to cherish kindness for them in his own bosom, to consult the *mollia tempora fandi*, and to guard against every thing which might give unnecessary offence, could not preserve him from dislike in some quarters, and reserve in more. However God

had graciously opened many hearts, which for a time had been closed, and now almost all considered him as their friend, and treated him as such. After doing our business I partook of what appeared to be, not in name only, (as is too often the case,) but in honest truth, the family-dinner at the parsonage, and I was as much pleased with my new acquaintance in the bosom of his family, as I had been among his parishioners.

This interesting visit has led me to meditate on the qualities which are calculated to smooth the way of a clergyman in his parish, and enable him to make open war against sin without being considered by sinners as their enemy, or at least as an odious intruder, who makes it his business to scrutinize with severity and to condemn with rigour the faults of others. How likely is it that he will be viewed in one of these lights, in proportion as his people are under the bondage of Satan, and living unto themselves and not unto their Saviour! Sinners are so far from being sensible of their misery, that they generally take a pride in some of those dispositions and habits which are most hateful to God. How eager will such characters be to make common cause with their vices, and to consider an attack on these as an attack upon themselves. Even those whose mental vision is not so completely distorted, who are not altogether blind to the deformity of sin, but yet cannot consent to part with it, will love darkness rather than light, will refuse to come unto the light lest their deeds should be reproved, and will shun a faithful minister who endeavours to pour light upon them*. If to these be added the herd of thoughtless people, who trouble themselves very little about the qualities of their dispositions and actions, provided they can maintain a good name for decency and honesty, and who hating the labour of thinking will dislike to be awakened from their slumber, and told that they are on the brink of a dreadful precipice which they cannot escape if they continue to pursue their present course; how great must be the proportion of almost every parish, which, to say the least, will be ill-disposed towards a true minister of Christ. Even his personal purity and holiness will operate as a standing reproof of all the descriptions of persons which have been mentioned, and will lead them, if this effect be not prevented by other means, to dislike and shun him. And these obstacles in his way may be much increased by prejudices in his parish against the Church of England and her ministers, and possibly by the arts of those who wish to foment such prejudices.

How then may a clergyman best encounter the difficulties which prevent a candid reception of his divine message, and a cordial union between himself and his people? Next to imploring the blessing of God, which must always be the great source of his hope, let him cultivate in his own bosom *humility, simplicity,* and *love.* These graces are of incalculable importance in every situation into which a clergyman can be thrown, and I dare not affirm, that they are more necessary when he is placed among the poor, than they would be had he the charge of a wealthy congregation. In either situation he will find them no less the foundation of his success as a minister, than of his hope as a Christian. It is difficult to describe the facilities which they give to one who is the spiritual guide of the poor. Their importance in this point of view cannot be entirely overlooked by those among our young clergy who are well disposed: but many of them do not appear to estimate it as they ought. I fear that some of them, when they leave college to settle in country curacies, go with an idea that their education, manners, and superior rank, give them such a claim to respect and attention from the villagers placed under their care, that it is less necessary for them to cultivate the dispositions which conciliate esteem, and confidence, and affection, than it would have been had they been placed among their superiors or equals. What a decorous attention to propriety, what suavity of manners, what a desire to render himself agreeable and to do little favours to those around him, do we generally see in a young clergyman, when on a visit to some gentleman in his neighbourhood! But walk with him round his parish, and you seldom witness by any means the same earnestness to recommend himself to his people. He often seems almost to *claim* from them that good opinion which he *courted* at the gen-

* John iii. 19, 20.

tleman's; and his manners, if not marked by something assuming and dogmatical, may not improbably possess but a small portion of those qualities which win the heart of the poor man: and yet the favour of those, for whose souls a minister is to answer, is not only of infinitely more importance to him than that of any of the neighbouring gentry; but he may justly apprehend that he will have most difficulty in obtaining it, and therefore should be doubly and trebly diligent in the use of all proper means to effect his object. In proportion as he is conscious that his divine message must be distasteful, in many of its parts, to sinful men, he ought to omit nothing, consistent with duty, which may serve to gild the pill, by conciliating those to whom he is to offer it. But through the wide disparity between him and his flock there cannot, with respect to temporal things, be much of the *idem velle* and *idem nolle*, of that coincidence of tastes and pursuits, which is found to be so fruitful a source of mutual attachment. He must therefore cultivate other bonds of union with the greater solicitude. These he will find in the dispositions under consideration, in humility, simplicity, and affection, and in the good offices which will flow from them. These heavenly qualities will prepare his way. By them rough places will be made plain, and crooked places straight, and vallies will be exalted, and mountains brought low; and he will find access to the hearts of numbers among his people.

Let us take a brief view of the situation of a well-disposed young clergyman in a village, and trace his course. He is thrown among a people who, probably, never heard of him before. They are naturally shy towards him as a stranger. They are conscious that his habits and manners are very different from theirs. They feel his superiority as a gentleman and a scholar. They are, perhaps, disposed to envy the ease which he appears to enjoy compared with their life of toil: and, as has been already remarked, those who are in an unconverted state, a very great majority, it is to be feared, of his parishioners feel a strong indisposition to the truths he delivers, and even to the holiness he exhibits in his life. They might be warranted in apprehending, that a man so gifted would undervalue them, and not like their society. But many of them will go further, and impute to him, in their own thoughts at least, contempt and disdain. How then must such impressions be counteracted? By those qualities shining forth, in his countenance and demeanor, which are the reverse of their apprehensions. He must disprove their suspicions of contempt by genuine humility. He must shew them by his simplicity that rustic manners will not necessarily disgust him, and that he is honest in his intercourse with them, and acts no part. And the warm affection which glows in his bosom will be the only effectual answer to their notions, that such a gentleman can never care much about poor folks like them. Its holy flame will melt down their reserve, and prepare them to receive candidly, and after a time even gladly, the truths which he is bound to deliver.

But it is not only for the purpose of combating the prejudices of his flock, that he will, in the course of his labours among them, stand in need of a large portion of these qualities. Were it possible that his people should be free from prejudice against either him or his doctrine, still if *his* heart was not under the influence of christian humility and simplicity, and was not warmed by true christian affection, he would be unable to hold forth to them the word of life in a way to reach *theirs*. This can very seldom be done, except when example and precept go hand in hand, and the minister adorns the Gospel which he delivers. With what grace can he, who is not truly humbled, enforce the duty of being "subject one to another, and clothed with humility;" or pourtray the blessedness of the meek, and of the poor in spirit? How can he whose bosom does not glow with the warmth of christian love, press on his people that new commandment which Jesus delivered to his disciples? Can he in whom these graces, and that of simplicity, do not predominate, "be gentle towards all men, apt to teach, patient, in meekness instructing those who oppose themselves?" Can he shew himself to be a genuine follower of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, whose condescension, and sympathy, and affection, in his intercourse with those placed under his care were such, that he reminds one Church that his life was marked by "simplicity and

godly sincerity;" that through his abundant love he wrote to them "with many tears," when one of them had dishonoured his christian profession; and that he would "very gladly" spend and be spent "for them:" and another Church that, teaching them "both publicly and from house to house,"—"by the space of three years," he "ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears:" and another, that he was gentle towards them, even as a nurse cherisheth her children, and being affectionately desirous of them was willing to have imparted, not the Gospel of God only, but also his own soul because they were dear to him?

These passages *, and many others in St. Paul's writings, present a beautiful picture of a true shepherd knowing and loving his sheep, and it might easily have been shewn in how eminent a degree he was known and loved by them. But what a mournful contrast to this picture do a minister and his people exhibit, where the intercourse between them is not marked by affection: where his pastoral labours are confined, except, perhaps, in a few instances, to a compliance with the directions of the rubric, and to formal visits, in which he feels himself to be performing rather an unpleasant task, and they on opening their doors to him shew by their countenances, that their hearts are closed, and that they shall be glad when he takes his leave! This must be too much the case when the graces under consideration do not reign in the breast of a clergyman. Even possessing these he must expect to encounter many difficulties: such is the distaste of the natural man to the things of God: but without them what can he expect? He can have no rational hope, that he shall partake in the success of the Apostles of Christ among the poor, if destitute of these important weapons of their warfare: nor can he expect a place, however humble, in the noble army of those, who, having turned many to righteousness, shall shine as the stars for ever and ever, if so unlike the Apostles, who will stand forth in the foremost ranks of that army.

B. T.

* 2 Pet. v. 5. Matt. v. 3. 5. John xv. 12. 17. 2 Tim. ii. 24, 25. 2 Cor. ii. 4. xii. 15. Acts xx. 31. 1 Thess. ii. 7, 8. See also the following passages—Phil. iv. 1. 1 Cor. iv. 12, 13. ix. 19—23. 2 Cor. vi. 11—13. xi. Gal. iv. 15. 19. 20. Acts xx. 37, 38. Ep. to Philemon. 2 Thess. ii. 19, 20. Rom. xii. 9, 10. 13. 15. 16. In applying some of these passages to modern times, undoubtedly, proper allowances must be made for a difference of circumstances; but still their general spirit ought to animate a minister and his people in every period of the Church, and a considerable portion of it on one side, if not on both, will be found, wherever the former has right views of his duty, and is zealous to perform it.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

It was not without a considerable degree of pleasure that I observed in your Number for May, 1804, a paper on the Causes of the Increase of Dissenters. I wish not to revive the controversy concerning extemporary sermons. As, however, it must be allowed that the Dissenters do, in a very great measure, promote their cause by adopting this practice, and as the lower classes of people, (who, in every congregation, are the most numerous,) are especially attracted by it, I think it is the duty of every minister seriously to enquire whether he may not, by following this mode of preaching, increase his influence, and thus be an instrument of rendering the Church more prosperous during his continuance in life. As for our posterity, so long as we neither, by precept or example, countenance any irregularity, we ought to leave them to God, and not be anxious about the event. Churchman, indeed, considers extemporary preaching as an *irregular* practice. I think, however, that no man who has ever read King Charles's strong and explicit prohibition of written sermons, (which is printed in the Statutes of the University of Cambridge †), will agree with him in this opinion. All, indeed, cannot preach extemporary discourses: but while every illiterate declaimer can mount into a dissenting pulpit and deliver his harangue, it is no credit,

† Would any of your Cambridge correspondents copy King Charles's Letter, and the University's Answer on this subject, I doubt not but you would cheerfully insert them both; they are (at present especially) richly worthy of a more extensive publication.

either to our zeal, our learning, our piety, or our talents, to confess that the majority among ourselves are unable to preach extempore.

One part of Churchman's paper stands particularly in need of explanation, he says, "Prayer is more important *than preaching*. The ungodly man may be converted from the error of his ways, and the servant of Christ may grow in grace without the help of sermons, but without prayer they cannot." (p. 275.) And again (p. 663) he says, "the most usual means employed by God for the conversion of the ungodly are prayer and the preaching of the Gospel. If we separate these means, then I say that the effect is sometimes produced by *prayer alone;* but *never by preaching* alone: and prayer is more *necessary* than preaching." Now we know that unless a sinner is brought to pray he never can be in a state of salvation; but I am inclined to think that prayer is, more properly speaking, an *evidence* than a *means* of conversion. Thus our Lord says to Ananias, speaking of Saul, "Behold he prayeth." Hence the question, as it appears to me, resolves itself into this, Are men more generally led to pray unto God by the preaching of the Word, or by the prayers of the congregation? Were the case as Churchman has stated it, I think the directions and the commissions given to the Apostles would not have been exactly as they now are; the command is, go and *preach*, not go and *pray*; and accordingly we find the disciples went forth and *preached*. In many cases, no doubt, they *prayed* before they *preached*; but we know this practice was by no means universal. Here I would appeal to experience. I would say to every minister, Do you generally find that persons in your congregations are convinced of their sins, and led to seek forgiveness of them by your discourses, or by our most excellent Liturgy? During my whole life I have only heard of three instances of persons converted to God by attending to the service of the Church of England, in places where the Gospel has not been preached, and, I trust, I should not exaggerate were I to say that I have *known* three thousand instances where it has.

Once more, I join heartily with Churchman, and also with Serena, in reprobating that careless, lifeless manner, in which the Prayers of our Church are so often read. I also join with them in protesting against that ranting, violent, extravagant manner in which many, even good men, deliver their discourses; yet I think it every way right and proper that our sermons should be delivered with a greater degree of warmth and vehemence than our supplications. Prayer is the humble address of a poor guilty sinner to a God of infinite majesty and holiness. The language of contrition is ever slow and solemn. How indeed can the trembling penitent, who feels that there is no health in him, even dare to lift up his voice in the presence of the Almighty! When, however, a minister stands up to preach to sinners, it is the address of a superior to his inferiors. We come with no slight authority. Our address is, Thus saith the Lord, and surely we ought to use every means in our power to command attention, both by energy of voice and dignity of action. It is, indeed, impossible to suppose that St. Paul offered up his affectionate prayer for the Philippians, and delivered his pathetic address to the Ephesian Elders, (Acts xx.), or preached his solemn sermon at Antioch, (Acts xiii. 38—41.), with the same degree of warmth, pathos, and energy.

I proceed next to point out a few causes, and but a few out of many that might be named, which, in my opinion, tend much more directly to increase the number of Dissenters than any which Churchman has assigned.

1. The superior zeal and activity of Dissenting Ministers. Too many among us, I fear, imagine, that when they have preached their weekly Sermon and read Prayers once or twice, they have done all that is requisite. Now here the Dissenters beat us completely. I know several instances among them where the same individual preaches three sermons on the Sunday, and as many in the course of the week. I know it will be said, that twice is as often as any person need attend a place of worship on the Sunday: I say the same, where persons *can* and *will* improve the rest of their time; but I will venture to assert that, in the greater number of congregations, one-third *cannot*, and another third *will* not, employ the rest of the day in reading and prayer.

The latter class usually spend it either in walking or visiting. The former finding the dissenting place of worship open, while their own is shut, go thither; and thus acquire an unsettled disposition, till, at length, some unexpected circumstance detaches them from us altogether. The Dissenters also generally get an advantage over us by the familiarity with which they visit their people; by their constant, active, and unremitting attention to the sick; by treating even their poorest members with respect, as brethren and equals, not as inferiors *. I say not but, in some instances, they descend below their situation, and make very improper compliances, for which they sometimes smart severely; but still their conduct is peculiarly suited to the present times. We are a degenerate race: we are led much more by feelings than by argument; and the majority will prefer him who treats them as equals, to him who looks upon them as inferiors, however strong the arguments may be in favour of the latter. But, alas! the unbeneficed clergy of the Church, whatever superiority in education, in learning, and situation they possess, are, in one respect, greatly inferior to most in their congregations. The salaries of curates do not average £60. per annum, while almost every journeyman can earn five-and-twenty shillings per week, and many twice that sum.

I wish, before I leave this head, to remark, that many ministers through a fear, lest their conduct should too much resemble that of the Dissenters, avoid some things laudable in themselves, and which have a most useful tendency. We know that our dissenting brethren seldom return from a visit without previously reading the Word of God and Prayer. Some of our most venerable and useful pastors have adopted this plan, while others, through a mistaken idea of irregularity, &c. altogether neglect it. I know, however, of no better way of turning our social meetings to a good account; of no way in which we can so forcibly impress upon our people that precept, "whether ye eat or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God;" and as far as my experience extends, I have ever observed that true vital religion usually flourishes most where this plan is adopted. I have, indeed, been in large and mixed companies where three or four ministers have been present, all pious, exemplary, useful characters in other respects, who have sat for hours together talking upon no other subjects than men of sense, who were totally ignorant of true religion, would have talked about; but I have found that Dissenters flourished beyond the usual proportion in their parishes.

2. Another cause of the increase of Dissenters is, the very different manner of preaching which they in general adopt; a style, in many cases, offensive to people of taste, but well suited to attract the attention of the lower orders: there may be often a disgusting coarseness of expression; but there is warmth, and energy, and vehemence. Cool calculators may easily ridicule them, but their *stentorial* exertions frequently contribute more to fill their chapels than any other cause whatever. People are led to think that the man is in earnest, and in general they know less about religion than about any other subject. As to the style which clergymen ought to adopt, I can only recommend a careful perusal of the valuable papers of B. T. on Preaching Intelligibly.

3. There is a third cause which, in the present day, contributes very powerfully to the Increase of Dissenters, but which I have never yet seen noticed, and that is the much greater facility with which accommodations can be procured in Dissenting Chapels than in the Churches of the Establishment. In all large towns our Churches are too small for the number of inhabitants; and that source of many evils, the introduction of private property into places of public worship, prevents them, in many instances, from being above half filled. I know an instance in a large town, where every seat in the Church is the exclusive property of some individual: a part, or perhaps the whole, of his family attend one service: during the rest of the day the pew is locked up, and thus the

* Permit me to recommend a small pamphlet lately published, entitled, Lectures on Preaching, by Dr. Doddridge, (price 2s. 6d.) It shews the system on which the Dissenters act, and how we may emulate their success. It contains also much valuable instruction on other topics.

minister has the mortification of seeing his Church empty, whilst multitudes are willing and even desirous to attend. To remedy this evil, perhaps, a subscription is opened, and a new Church built; but still the poor are most commonly excluded, either by the high price of seats, or by some degrading differences of accommodation. Meanwhile a Dissenter comes and builds a Chapel. He lays the whole country under contribution towards it, and by this and various other methods, he offers you his seats at less than half the price at which you can procure them in the Church. He goes further: he retains a number of those seats in his own hands, and lets them yearly, half-yearly, or quarterly, as is most convenient to his customers; and we well know that many persons can better afford to give five shillings per annum for a sitting, than to pay a guinea or two down at once. I say nothing at present about the superior neatness, civility, &c., which are generally met with in Dissenting Chapels; but I have been myself most forcibly struck with the contrast, and cannot help lamenting that our cause should suffer so severely by the negligence of those who ought to defend it; for I apprehend that the decayed and ruinous condition of some of our Churches is more owing to the sloth and carelessness of the officiating ministers than to any other cause whatever.

HARDWICKE.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

In your Volume for 1803, p. 572, you have strongly pressed on your readers, "the duty of setting apart particular seasons for humiliation and prayer, on account of the present circumstances of our country." While I request them to review the arguments which you have there employed, as equally applicable to the present moment, I would beg leave to found on them an exhortation to set apart, not merely "particular seasons for humiliation and prayer," but a certain portion of time in each day for a distinct and earnest address to God in favour of our native land. The state of public affairs, it is true, has recently assumed a more encouraging aspect; but there is no small danger lest this appearance of security should betray Christians into a neglect of those means which can alone ensure to us lasting repose. It is to guard against this danger that I now address you. Let not then the hope of continental aid, or the breaking up of the camps at Boulogne, produce in us a relaxed attention to the great duty of prayer. Let us call to mind what has happened to nations similarly circumstanced in former times. "When Ephraim saw his sickness, and Judah saw his wound, then went Ephraim to the Assyrian, and sent to King Jareb." But how could the Assyrian help those whose continuance in sin withheld good things from them. Therefore, it is declared, "yet could he not heal you, nor cure you of your wound." Let the example also of Zedekiah speak loudly in warning to us. When his allies the Egyptians advanced towards Jerusalem, the besieging army of the Chaldeans "was broken up." But while they continued to sin, their respite could be of no long duration; they could enjoy only a transient repose. Therefore "thus saith the Lord, deceive not yourselves, saying the Chaldeans shall surely depart from us: for they shall not depart. For though ye had smitten the whole army of the Chaldeans that fight against you, and there remained but wounded men among them, yet should they rise up every man in his tent, and burn this city with fire." Thus, though we should succeed in rousing all Europe to our assistance; though not a single tent should remain at Boulogne, or a single transport, destined to the invasion of this country, in any French port: nay, though we should discomfit army after army of our enemies, and sink their fleets in the depths of the sea; still, while our sins are retained, an instrument of the divine vengeance would be found. Let us then pray and faint not, till the nation has become alive to its sins, till a national repentance and amendment has taken place, and our "Jerusalem" is again "a praise in the earth."

I subjoin a prayer of Bishop Hall, which appears to me very suitable to the present state of our country. I have often used it in my own family; and if you should think proper to in-

sert it, it may prove an acceptable help to the family devotions of many of your readers.

BOETHOS.

A PRAYER, EXTRACTED FROM BISHOP HALL'S "HOLY ORDER OF MOURNERS IN SION."

O our God, thou hast removed our souls far from peace, thou hast most justly filled us with thine indignation; for we have deserved that thou shouldst pour our iniquities upon us, and shouldst bring upon us the fruits of our own thoughts, and measure our works into our bosoms, and cause us to drink at thy hand the cup of thy fury; yea, even to have the dregs of the cup of trembling to be wrung out to us, for we have walked every one after the imagination of his own evil heart. Our transgressions are with us and are multiplied before thee, and though we have professed to be humbled under thy mighty hand, we have not cried to thee in our hearts, neither have we loathed ourselves in our own sight for the evils that we have committed; so that we do now justly lie down in our shame, and our confusion covereth us; willingly acknowledging that our iniquities have most deservedly turned away thy blessings from us, and drawn thy judgments upon our heads.

But, O Lord, hast thou so smitten us that there is no healing for us? have we put ourselves utterly out of the reach of thy boundless mercies? Art not thou the God that retainest not thy anger for ever, because thou delightest in mercy? O thou the hope of Israel, and the Saviour thereof in time of trouble, return, return to thy people in the tender bowels of thine infinite pity and compassion, humble our souls thoroughly under the sense of our many backslidings and grievous provocations of the eyes of thy glory. Oh, strike thou our heart with an unfeigned repentance of all our evil ways, and once again speak peace unto thy servants. Was there ever a more stiff-necked and rebellious people, O Lord, than thine Israel? more eminent in abused mercies? more notorious in all kinds of abominable wickedness? more exercised with variety of judgments? yet, when they cried to thee in their distress, thou wert still ready to hear and deliver them, and to renew thy so often forfeited blessings upon them, and wouldst not let loose thy vengeance upon them till there was no remedy. Behold, we are thy people though a sinful one, a second Israel both for sins and mercies: now, Lord, since it is thy marvellous mercy that we are not yet consumed, be still pleased to magnify thy infinite goodness in thy gracious forbearances and our powerful conversion to thee. And though we cannot but confess that we are a sinful nation, a people laden with iniquity, a seed of evil doers; yet, Lord, thou knowest thou hast thy secret ones amongst us, a people that prayeth and trembleth at thy judgments, and waiteth humbly at the door-posts of thy sanctuary; a people that desireth to walk close with thee their God, and to be approved of thee in all their ways; a people that sigheth and mourneth for the abominable sins of the land of their nativity: O, for their sakes be thou intreated to hold off thy revenging hand from this sinful nation, and even yet still provoke us by thy goodness to repentance. O thou, the righteous and merciful Judge of the world, who, even for ten righteous persons wouldst have spared a Sodom and Gomorrah from their fiery execution, be pleased tenderly to regard the cries of thy many hundred faithful and devout souls that sue to thee for the stay and removal of thy deserved judgments. Oh, do thou look down from heaven, and behold from the habitation of thy holiness and thy glory, the unfeigned humiliation of thy servants, who are prostrate before thee with fastings, and weeping, and mourning: turn away thy heavy displeasure from us, and pity thy sanctuary which is desolate: so shall our mouths be full of the praises of thy name, and thy saints shall rejoice, and sing new songs unto the God of our salvation.—*Amen.*

MISCELLANEOUS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

It is always a high gratification to me to see Religion adorned by the amiable qualities which properly belong to her. I have the happiness of still numbering several friends who afford me this pleasure in an eminent degree. But several of a similar character, who were my delight in former years, are no longer among the living; and I look back on them as on a sort of guardian angels sent by God to invite me into the path of duty, by strewing it with its own appropriate flowers. Among these was a young lady, from whose example while living I received many important lessons, and whose image always recurs to me with a sort of melancholy pleasure, arising even more from a sense of her excellence than of her friendship. With your permission I will lay a short sketch of her history and character before your readers.

Miss C—— F—— was daughter of a country gentleman, whose family I have had the pleasure of knowing many years. She and her sisters were educated by their mother, now no more, in whom vigour of mind, and much natural vivacity, were combined with warm affections, and all were under the direction of Religion. On entering the family a stranger must have been struck by the domestic harmony he witnessed, and by the modesty, cheerfulness, and unaffected politeness of the young women. Their dress was always remarkably neat, and displayed some taste, without appearing to be much studied. While their intelligence rendered them capable of conversing with persons of good information and experience, their amiable manners recommended them particularly to the young. Pardon me, Sir, if a recollection of former scenes should have led me too far into a description of these young ladies, when it was my intention to confine myself to an account of one of them.

If a stranger of a reflecting and religious character, after being gratified by the attractive manners and pleasing exterior of Miss C—— F——, entered into conversation with her, he would probably be surprised to find so much thought, and such discriminating good sense in her opinions, particularly on points of duty. He would perhaps ask himself, by what secret such reflection, and so well-informed a conscience, could have been combined with so much unaffected cheerfulness and politeness, at the age of twenty-one. After a further acquaintance he would discover, that this secret was found in *true Religion*. It is to the colour and tone of the Religion of Miss C—— F——, and to the circumstances that, under the blessing of God, to whom be all the glory, served to encircle it with such amiable qualities, and to banish those of an opposite nature which too often appear in religious characters, that I wish to call the attention of your readers.

The religion of the mother of Miss C—— F—— would have appeared to some persons so defective, that they would have doubted its reality. She knew very little of the different sects among us, still less of the controversies on certain doctrinal points; nor could she lay down with any precision the bounds and limits of several of those scriptural truths which she most firmly held. She would have made so bad a figure in a conversation with Theodosia, whose character you laid before your readers some time since, that that lady would probably have pronounced her to be completely in the dark, if not in the gall of bitterness, and bond of iniquity. Her religion, it is true, would have been improved, especially in the early periods of my acquaintance with her, by a more accurate consideration of the leading truths of her Bible. She held them firmly, and with a simplicity of heart, and a steady application of them to her daily practice, from which almost any Christian would have derived a useful lesson. But her view of them was too general and indiscriminate, and this, in union with that charity which "believeth all things and hopeth all things," led her occasionally to give, without reserve, the right hand of christian fellowship to those who

professed to hold the truths she loved, but who, in fact, held them in a sense which quite altered their nature and their practical effect. In her latter years this source of error was in a measure corrected, but it was never entirely removed.

Miss C—— F——, however, did not appear to suffer materially from this defect in her instructor. Her sound understanding enabled her to acquire, by degrees, that accuracy which her mother did not possess: and in very early youth, when such accuracy is less important, she learnt, through God's blessing on her mother's precepts and example, what is infinitely important at every age, namely, "to receive the divine word in simplicity and in the love of it, so as to profit by it," and to make it her daily guide both in the regulation of her tempers, and in her outward conduct. She was taught the leading principles of the Gospel, namely, the sinfulness of man, the love of God, his infinite mercy in redemption by Christ, the intercession of that divine advocate and his care of his people, and the absolute dependance of man on divine aid through the Holy Spirit: these she was taught before she was of an age to read her Bible, and to her they were not a dead letter, the subject of formal lectures, to be laid aside when a lecture was over, as little wanted till the next should commence; but a living system, to parts of which her mother called her attention several times almost every day, on little occasions of praise or blame, of indulgence or of prohibition. And her mother appealed to these divine principles with such reverence, and at the same time with such sunshine of soul and genuine kindness, arising from her own love, joy, and peace in believing, that they became closely united in the daughter's apprehension with those dispositions, and excited them on being presented to her mind. Philosophers and moralists often insist on the powerful effects arising from a concatenation of ideas and feelings. Here was a concatenation in favour of that close union between the truths of the Gospel and the fruits of the Spirit, in which the true value of the former consists. Those who have observed the prodigious force of early habits, will know how to appreciate its importance.

Miss C—— F—— also saw her mother's instructions beautifully exemplified in her character and conduct. She saw that Religion was the source of all that was excellent in her. Her activity in domestic and social duties, her forbearance with servants, her courtesy to those of whom she could not approve, her beneficence to the poor, her motherly and sisterly affection for the true followers of Christ, her earnestness in instructing her children, her quick sensibility to their faults, and her steady perseverance, notwithstanding the uncommon warmth of her affection, in correcting them: all these, and many other daily habits, evidently flowed from her Religion. They were not the offspring of mere instinctive kindness; they were not practised to obtain a good name among men, or to be pleaded as meritorious before God: but being sensible how much had been forgiven her, she loved much; feeling the evil of sin in the righteous condemnation of fallen man, and in the grievous burthens laid on her Saviour, she shunned it as she would a serpent; and penetrated with the love of holiness from its being the very essence of the divine character, and from its bright effulgence in the life and sufferings of him, who to her was altogether lovely as well as awfully great and pre-eminent, she hungered and thirsted after it. Without doubt the christian life was thus pourtrayed before the daughter's eyes to smooth her religious course, by giving maternal precept all the advantage which it could derive from filial sympathy: and it was not pourtrayed in vain. Her heart like her mother's was fixed on God: her life, while she pursued occupations and partook of amusements suited to her age, was devoted to him. For both in the choice of her occupations and amusements, in the time which she devoted to them, and in the dispositions which she cherished while engaged in them, she had his good pleasure principally in view. A girl's school in her father's village employed many of her hours. It was highly pleasing to see what a deep interest she took in her little pupils, and what christian wisdom and christian kindness breathed through the rules which she formed for them. I trust that she has not run in vain, nor laboured in vain, in this branch of her stated occupations, but that some

little ones, first led to a pious knowledge of Christ and his Gospel by her, will, in his great day, rise up to be her glory and joy.

It was a very pleasing feature in the character of this young lady, that though she had a tender conscience, and evidently called herself to a strict account, she was extremely far from being severe in judging others. Indeed she would scarcely ever make their faults the subject of conversation. And yet she had a quick perception of the distinction between right and wrong in her acquaintance, and carefully abstained from praising what was not praise-worthy. I have often admired the serene good humour with which she let things pass in silence which she did not approve, when among mere acquaintance. On such things occurring among those with whom she was more familiar, she would, on lighter occasions endeavour to shew what she thought, and to give things a turn by a good humoured shake of her head, or a little exclamation, half jest, half earnest: and on more important ones, especially when any one was present whom she thought likely to be misled, she would express her disapprobation in a more serious manner, but was always studious to avoid giving unnecessary offence. If she saw in the offending party a propensity to enter into a dispute, she bent her whole force to restore ease and good humour, but without improperly giving up her point. On such occasions how adroitly have I seen her introduce a little pleasantry, and by calling up in her own mind a double portion of simplicity, gentleness, and affection, dissipate the rising warmth of an opponent, who has thus been sometimes led to a voluntary confession of a fault, instead of making it the subject of an angry and unavailing dispute. "Overcome evil with good" was a maxim which she exemplified better than almost any one I have ever known.

It not unfrequently happens, that those who are religious see nothing in the irreligious but their faults, and view them in no light but as warnings and beacons to point out what is to be dreaded and shunned. Miss C—— F—— was far from insensible to the essential distinction between the children and the enemies of God; and she well knew that all mankind are divided into those two classes. She was also fully aware that all the thoughts, words, and actions of those who are not God's children must be offensive to him, because it is not their predominant motive to serve and please him. But she endeavoured to derive benefit from them, not merely as warnings and beacons, but also in a certain sense as examples for her imitation. Did she see remarkable candour, incorruptible honesty, persevering and cheerful industry, kindness not to be stifled by ingratitude, and gratitude which could out-live the affection of its object, she brought herself to the test, and enquired what was *her* state as to the quality which engaged her admiration. If she found herself inferior or only equal to her irreligious acquaintance, in any of these respects, she was humbled and roused to greater exertions. "How shameful," she would say to an intimate friend, "that the children of this world, acting on such inferior principles, and engaged in courses which have not the divine blessing, should ever be pre-eminent in any of those dispositions and habits to which the children of light are so loudly called! Oh, let us gird up the loins of our mind and be holy as he who hath called us is holy, at least let me gird up mine!" Viewing matters in this light, she conducted herself towards her worldly acquaintance with a degree of respect, with a kindness and a courtesy, which it is very difficult for those to feel by whom they are looked upon solely as rocks, shoals, and quicksands, in the ocean of life. How much must she have found her way smoothed in the performance of the divine command, "love thy neighbour as thyself;" and how greatly must this have conduced to her progress in obedience to that still greater precept, "love thy God with all thy heart!"—"He who loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen." And no doubt the degree of our love to God must depend very much on that which we feel for our fellow-creatures.

It was one of the most remarkable circumstances in the character of this young lady, that cheerful and lively as she was, she never appeared to have the least wish to join in those public amusements which some look

upon as the very soul of youthful enjoyment. She had not, I think, a turn for music, and therefore it is not surprising that she did not long to go to concerts. But no one was more active in a game of battledore and shuttlecock: or, to speak of higher things, more capable of relishing the poetry of Milton and of Cowper: no one was more fond of visiting striking scenes of nature, or eminent works of art: or of admiring the setting sun enthroned in a pavilion of majestic clouds, and adorning them with streams of light infinitely varying in hue and splendor? And yet I am convinced, that she never had a wish to go to a play or to a ball, or to feast her eyes at Vauxhall or Ranelagh. She was happy at home, and among her friends; and her desires did not stray abroad. And how was this, under God's blessing, brought about? By her mother always acting on the plan, not only of keeping her children from scenes of danger, but of devising for them innocent amusements, procuring for them proper companions, and putting them in the way of filling up their time both usefully and agreeably. Vain is it, as you, Sir, intimate, I think, in your Review of Burder's Sermon on Amusements, for religious parents to expect their children to be contented and happy when forbidden to join in the pleasures most prized by the worldly, unless they find suitable employment for their buoyant spirits and youthful energies. If a man were debarred common food, and food of another kind were not provided for him, we know what the event would be. And yet, under a state of things, with respect to the pleasures of youth, not very dissimilar, parents are sometimes surprised that their children are gloomy and discontented, or perverse and inclined to long for forbidden joys. These evils, especially the latter, will often spring up in a soil so congenial to them as the heart of man, even when all means are used to eradicate them. What then is to be expected under a system, by which they must be in a very high degree fostered and cherished?

But the evil which has been mentioned often proceeds, in a great measure, from another source. Some religious parents represent the pleasures of the worldly as no pleasures at all even to the worldly, but as in truth a compound of pain and disappointment. Now their children find it very difficult to give full credit to this statement. They feel a desire for some of those pleasures, and cannot but think that they should find them highly gratifying. They see other young people eager to enjoy them, and often not less eager when they have had some experience of them. How can they believe them hypocrites pretending to receive pleasure when they do not? Under these circumstances is it wonderful that, when their minds are not under the steady influence of Religion, they wish to judge for themselves, and make a little trial of those scenes of which they hear such contradictory accounts? And will not a desire of this kind seize them with tenfold force, when they feel a want of pleasures at home? Here then is a complication of evils. The ways of Religion, instead of ways of pleasantness, appear gloomy and full of mortification; those of sin are suspected to be strewed with flowers; and what is of incalculable importance, the sound judgment of the parents, if not also their veracity, is called seriously into question. How did Mrs. F—— proceed? She, with great simplicity, represented the case as it really is. She did not say, that unhallowed pleasures were not pleasures to persons unrenewed in the spirit of their minds, but she shewed her children that such pleasures stand in direct opposition to duty; that they are full of snares, and are followed either by eternal ruin in the next world, or at best by bitter remorse and a course of painful struggles against bad habits in this. She did not say, that the wine was not sweet, but that there was poison in the bowl. She further used to paint the depravity of taste, and of feeling from which such pleasures derived their charms. That in some instances the enjoyment consisted in criminality itself: and in others, was connected with concomitant circumstances of so criminal a nature as ought to deprive it of all its sweetings, and render the scenes in which it is found distasteful and odious. She used to illustrate this in the same kind of way as Mr. Wilberforce (whose book, by the way, was her delight) does the real nature of theatrical entertainments. "Should you

like to be in any company, however agreeable in other respects, in which your friends were abused, or your parents decried? And why should you not? Because you love your friends and parents. And ought not a similar cause to prevent your relishing any scene, in which there are offences against your God? If you *do* relish such scenes, how can you think that you really love him! Many outrages against him might be mentioned which, young as you are, would even now disgust you with any scene in which they took place. Remember then, that not only atrocious sins, but *all* sins are infinitely odious to him, and heinous in themselves; and constantly pray that you may be brought to see sin in all its shades and degrees in the same light in which it appears to him, and that your taste may be more and more assimilated to his." Such were the lessons of the mother to her children, even from their infancy, and the blessing of God was upon them.

Miss C—— F—— liked religious conversation, but the part she took in it was always marked by great modesty, and generally related to some point in which she thought herself more immediately concerned. In such conversations she seldom failed to evince her knowledge and her judgment, as well as her unaffected piety. In knowledge and judgment indeed, as has been already remarked, she exceeded her mother. This superiority, however, never seemed to elevate her. The practical fruits of such attainments were with her all in all, and of these she saw in her mother a rich abundance, far exceeding what she conceived herself to possess. But even towards those who were evidently far below herself in holy dispositions and habits, she always conducted herself with humility. For she had a low opinion of her own attainments; and, be they what they might, she bore strongly in mind who it was who made her to differ from others.

Great however as was her proficiency in the divine life, I had opportunities of knowing that she had occasionally strong mental trials. Her countenance in a morning would sometimes betray to her intimate friends, that there had been a conflict in her bosom. Of what nature these searchings of heart might be, I do not particularly know. I believe she seldom talked about them to any one, and never to any one but her mother. She seemed to look upon them very much as secrets between herself and her God. Indeed she had a great dislike to what may be called *babbling* in Religion, and discouraged it among those over whom she had an influence. She saw, in two or three instances which fell under her notice, how much unguarded conversations on religious subjects, and, above all, on the personal experience of the speaker, lead to self-deceit, spiritual pride, and hypocrisy.

I really, Sir, find it difficult to take leave of this young lady; but my paper reminds me that I am in danger of occupying a greater part of your Miscellany than you usually allot to the letter of a correspondent. You need not be told, that she could not possess the qualities I have mentioned without being adorned by many sister graces, which one who loved and esteemed her as I did would have a pleasure in describing. To *our* weak apprehension her death, at the age of twenty-six, (a death which was in perfect unison with her life,) was an irreparable loss to the circle in which she moved. We are apt fondly to paint to ourselves the advantage as well as the pleasure we should have derived from her society, and the rare benefits she might have conferred on her family and neighbourhood if she had become a wife and a mother. But how vain are such speculations! God knows how to chuse his own instruments of good, and will in his choice always be guided by the tenderest mercy as well as by unerring wisdom. Let us commit even our most valuable and our dearest friends entirely to his disposal!

T. R.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Your correspondent George, in your number for August, writes with good humour, and I dare say that his primary object in controverting the arguments of S. F. N. was to remove his own doubts as to Field Sports affording an innocent recreation. However, I could have wished to have seen more tenderness for the scruples of S. F. N. Supposing them to be

ill-founded, still the conscientious spirit which dictates them surely called for encouragement, rather than the sort of check it appears to me to have received. George might be certain, that a young man when deliberating whether he ought to relinquish sports to which he had been much addicted, would have a pretty strong natural bias on one side, and I think he will wish, on a little reflection, that he had not run the risk of adding to that bias by treating both him and his arguments somewhat cavalierly. If he thought S. F. N. wrong, it might be proper to point out his error, but ought not this to have been done with delicacy and with an anxious care not to treat a tender conscience roughly, and tempt an ingenuous youth to give up in disgust such truly christian deliberations on points of duty as those of S. F. N. George has laughed at S. F. N. as a dead shot. He has also drawn a most unfair comparison between him and the Fox in the Fable; between a young man who, through very laudable scruples, is disposed to relinquish a favourite amusement, and a Fox meant in the Fable to represent an hypocritical worn out sinner, professing to repent of his criminal pleasures, when he can no longer enjoy them. He has also presumed, in direct opposition, as I think, to the evidence before him, that S. F. N. has taken up a *hasty impression:* he has pointed in significant italics at his *inexperience:* and he treats his arguments with a degree of levity not well suited to the occasion, nor very respectful, though he disclaims intentional disrespect. Permit me to ask George, what he would think of any one who, in a similar spirit and style, argued with one of his young parishioners in favour of balls, or cards, or some other amusement which George disapproved? I have no doubt but he is anxious, that tenderness of conscience among the younger part of his flock, especially when it operates in opposing barriers to that thirst for amusements which is so great a snare to persons of their age, should be fostered with care, and not discouraged.

But to pass from the manner of George's animadversions on the Letter of S. F. N. to their matter, how stands the argument between these two gentlemen? S. F. N. is disposed to think, that what are called Field Sports are not in unison with the great christian duties of universal benevolence, mercy, and charity, and therefore are not innocent amusements: and without formally arguing this point, he thinks it may be sufficiently established by every man asking himself what he should think of angels, or other superior beings, who should amuse themselves by angling for men from the skies, or by exercising their skill in destroying them in any other way? How would this accord with his ideas of angelic kindness and mercy? A pretty strong appeal, in my apprehension, to the common sense, as well as to the right feelings, of Christian Readers! But George thinks the case put by S. F. N. totally inapplicable, because, in his opinion, there is no analogy, and no parallel can be drawn, between angels and men and between men and game. I cannot but think, that this sentiment of your correspondent George betrays stronger marks of being taken up hastily, than any thing which has fallen from the pen of S. F. N. Is there, then, Sir, no analogy between the duties of angels and men and the dispositions and habits they are called upon, by their common Creator, to cultivate? Is it not the happiness and the glory of both to be like him? And does not benevolence hold so distinguished a place among the perfections which continually abide in the Deity, that God is even identified with it in the language of inspiration: God is love? Unless then it can be shewn, that the benevolence which befits angels is not to be sought and cultivated by man, and that habits which would not accord with that benevolence in the former, are not improper for the latter, there must be allowed to be a very obvious and close analogy between angels and men in the point of view in which S. F. N. compares them. Both are to cultivate the same holiness; and amusements which do not accord with that object cannot befit either. But George says, there is no analogy between men and game. It is true, men are not food for angels; but S. F. N. must in all fairness be supposed to put his case under an hypothetical assumption, for the purpose of his argument, that they are so: a mode of proceeding sanctioned by all writers, including George himself. For George makes this supposition, and tells us

what he should think of angels amusing themselves in angling for men, if men were their food. And what does he tell us? I must say, that I have scarcely ever been more surprised than to find, that George can see nothing incongruous, nothing abhorrent to the pure benevolence of angels in their taking *this amusement*, (for in its being their *amusement* lies the stress of the argument), under the circumstances he has supposed. And can George figure to himself an angel's countenance beaming with pleasure, as he is drawing up a man writhing at a hook to the skies? If the Holy Being were commanded by his God to execute a commission of death (as may, in fact, often be the case), I can conceive zeal to perform the divine will, together with a full and lively conviction that the misery inflicted is, in the counsels of the Deity, a mean for the production of final good, so far overpowering his sense of pain in being the instrument of present evil, as to afford him even a gratification on the whole in the office assigned to him. But to make the case parallel to that of Field Sports, we must suppose that he has received no such commission, but destroys men (angles for them for instance) for his pleasure. And do any of your readers think, that this *could* afford pleasure to a being of pure benevolence. As well might cursing and blessing proceed out of the same mouth, or Christ have fellowship with Belial. If then any man finds an amusement in such an occupation, are we not constrained to impute the very possibility of this to a defect in his benevolence? And can we avoid further concluding, that such an amusement being at variance with that heavenly disposition, must, as S. F. N. intimates, have a tendency to check and stifle it? I am certain I need not argue with George, that if this be so, nothing further need be advanced against Field Sports, for he will be as earnest as myself in asserting the necessity of a renewal in the image of God, and the duty of hungering and thirsting continually after a nearer resemblance of the adorable perfections of his holiness.

But George appears to deny that Field Sports have the tendency here imputed to them. And on what grounds? Because he has not found that, in fact, they do blunt the benevolent and tender feelings; and he refers particularly to the case of two excellent clergymen of his acquaintance. I greatly doubt of the propriety of referring the decision of a point like the present, in which a satisfactory conclusion may be drawn by fair and obvious inference from scriptural principles, to the limited experience of each individual who is to decide. But if experience be the test to be chosen, at least its voice ought to be very distinct and loud, before it should be suffered to outweigh such clear deductions from reason. Suppose your correspondent were chiding a child for pursuing the spiders in his house, and transfixing them with a pin (an amusement which might be defended by some of the arguments alleged in favour of Field Sports), would he readily listen to any one who should tell him, that he need be under no apprehension of the child's affectionate feelings being blunted, for that in the course of his experience he had not observed that effect to follow? If, in such a case, he would distrust his friend's experience, he ought, in that under consideration, to distrust his own. But if reference is to be had to experience, I must be allowed to say, that mine would lead me to a conclusion different from that at which George has arrived. Not that I think every sportsman inferior to his neighbour in benevolence. By no means: for benevolence has many enemies besides Field Sports; and some of them, which the sportsman may have escaped, may have made serious depredations among his neighbours. There are also many things friendly to benevolence, which may have found more place among the principles, the connections, the occupations, and the habits of one who partakes of Field Sports, than in those of others who live around him, and may so foster his benevolence and so counteract the tendency of those sports to impair it, that he may have a larger share of that disposition than they. These and other causes will frequently make it impossible to decide what effect such sports have had on particular individuals. But taking a *general* view of the sportsmen I have known, I certainly do think that I discover an unfavourable effect on their benevo-

lence from their field diversions. I could enter into some particulars in proof of this, but it would be invidious, and would wound the feelings perhaps of some excellent men, and stir up a spirit of resentment in others: effects which I should deeply regret. This is a subject upon which I had much rather appeal to the sober and calm judgment of the parties concerned, than convict them in the face of the public. Let me then put it to every sportsman, whether he cannot recollect occasions on which he gives pain to animals with comparatively little feeling, though had he not been imbued with a sportman's habit he would have felt acutely. And if this be the case, let him consider whether this circumstance must not be connected, both as cause and effect, with his *general character* in a way, on sober reflection, not very satisfactory to him. Should the result of his scrutiny be, that his tender and affectionate feelings have received no injury from amusing himself with pursuing and destroying game, he must at least look on his case as a little singular. He would probably have very lively apprehensions, that a child's benevolence would be injured, who diverted himself frequently with pursuing and killing troublesome insects in his father's house: and he would probably have very strong objections to a relation of his, who unfortunately was to appear as a criminal in a court of justice, being tried by a jury of butchers. Let him fairly consider on what ground such apprehensions and objections would rest, and see whether he can *wholly* separate the cases of the child and of the butcher from his own.

As the case of the butcher has been mentioned, I must not dismiss it without two or three additional observations. A butcher pursuing his calling as a business may dislike it, and therefore be far less likely to have his feelings blunted, than a sportsman who acts from the freest choice, and cannot be supposed to dislike *his* work of destruction. Besides, he who follows a lawful and necessary calling may hope for God's blessing to defend him from the pernicious consequences which would naturally flow from it; but he who voluntarily, and as a diversion, takes up a pursuit fraught with such consequences cannot reasonably expect the same divine protection. And, in fact, what different estimates would the common sense of mankind form of two men, one of whom slaughtered animals to obtain a livelihood, and the other for his diversion? I certainly do not mean to call sportsmen voluntary butchers. There are several important points of distinction between the two cases; but there are also others of resemblance, which are not unworthy of the serious consideration of every gentleman, before he takes his gun or his greyhounds into the field. I had rather leave them to his consideration than detail them.

But it may be replied to what I have alleged: Your argument cannot be sound; for God would never have appointed animals to be food for man, if he could not follow his inclination, in taking and killing, them without injury to his benevolence. That he may obey the calls of *duty* to pursue and destroy animals, and yet be preserved by the divine protection from the injury threatened by such an occupation, I believe; because God will suffer none "to be tempted," (by what they meet with in the path of duty) "above that" they "are able, but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that" they "may be able to bear it." 1 Cor. x. 13. But the case is quite different when we bring temptations unnecessarily upon ourselves. We may walk through the valley of the shadow of death and fear no evil, if we are engaged in the work of God, and therefore have grounds for believing that he is with us. But who will dare to walk in that valley unbidden, and hope to be safe? If impelled by desire so to do, the proper answer to his own inclinations would be "it is written, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Matt. iv. 7.

I have purposely avoided grounding my arguments on any statement which could afford George a colour for saying that it was unfair. He complains much, I think far too much, of S. F. N. in this respect. But the arguments of that gentleman do not stand in need of exaggerated statements to give them force. They apply against Field Sports with whatever moderation they may be pursued. To be sure, where they are least pursued there is, *ceteris paribus*,

the smallest share of evil, and there of course S. F. N. will find least to condemn.

I have purposely avoided interrupting the course of my observations, by taking notice of one of the arguments brought forward by George. He says, we cannot argue that an amusement is unfit for men, because it is not proper for angels; and produces that of playing at bowls, as an instance of one which would evidently be unsuitable for angels, though not for men. But why would this diversion not befit angels? Not because, like Field Sports, it is inimical to some holy disposition, but merely from its being too trifling for beings of such superior intelligence. Had it been at variance with any branch of holiness, it must have been an amusement which *all* beings, who are required to cultivate holiness, would be bound to shun. There are many boyish amusements which would ill suit a man, on account of the superiority of his intellect. But point me out one which is adverse to benevolence, and *therefore* improper for the man, and I shall at once pronounce that it should be interdicted to the boy. George, therefore, has fallen into the error of arguing from particulars to generals. Having shewn that an amusement of one description, though improper for angels would be innocent for man, he draws a general conclusion wholly inapplicable to the case of amusements of another description, namely, those which are adverse to holy dispositions.

The answers of George to the reasoning of S. F. N. have now been considered; and most of your readers will probably think, that the latter of these gentlemen has no reason to be ashamed of the opinions which he entertains, or of his arguments in support of them. He appears to me to have expressed himself with a degree of good sense and candour very creditable both to his head and to his heart.

But George not only endeavours to invalidate the objections to Field Sports, but produces some positive arguments in their favour. Let us now consider these. The first is, that they induce him to take the degree of exercise which is good for his health. He does not like to walk without an object, and they supply him with one. I have no doubt, but that this is a candid account of the case, and that many have the same motive with this gentleman for taking out their dog and gun. But surely gentlemen who act upon it must have some want of ingenuity. Can they find no garden in which they may work, no neighbour whose conversation may amuse them during a walk? Nay, to descend lower, have they no wood to cut, are there no grounds near, whose owner would thank them for levelling his hillocks, or spudding up his nettles and thistles? Surely incitements to brisk exercise may be found without having recourse to one which subjects other animals to pain and death! If, after all, a gentleman is so delicate in his choice of pleasures, that he can find no sufficient inducement to exercise, but in the pursuit of game, he might do well to consider himself as somewhat fastidious, and as called upon to correct the evil by a little wholesome self-denial. Let him put a force upon himself, and walk resolutely every day for a month "to such a gate and back again," (a course to which George seems so averse), and if he is a man of sound religious principle, I think I can promise him, that he will not only not repent of having given the month's respite to the hares and partridges, but that he will not be very likely to resume his gun. If he is not a truly religious man, he will probably return to the house whence he went out, and find it "swept and garnished." Matt. xii. 44.

It may not be amiss for religious men who shoot or course, for the sake of exercise, though like George they have some doubts about these diversions, to recollect how commonly amusements which they condemn are excused on similar grounds. The card-player cannot manage to pass a cheerful evening (and what more conducive to health, and to benevolence also, than cheerfulness?) without his cards, which to be sure are abused to bad purposes by many, but never by him. Mamma must take her daughter to the ball, because she should not be entirely debarred the pleasures of other young women: and Miss is always so good, and Mamma so prudent, that no mischief can follow. Let us not countenance such modes of reasoning by lightly using a similar one in favour of Field Sports.

But George will agree with me,

that his argument for these sports is wholly inadmissible, unless they can be shewn to be perfectly compatible with benevolence. If they are not so, I am sure he would make no sacrifice of that "godliness" which "is profitable unto all things," for the sake of "bodily exercise," which "profiteth little." 1 Tim. iv. 8. Nay, if he has doubts on the subject, if he is not *sure* that his arguments are valid, and that S. F. N.'s and mine are unsound, he will apply the excellent rule quoted by him from Corbet (happy am I when those with whom I am obliged to discuss differences of opinion appeal to such rules!) "what thou doubtest, do not."

Even if he should be satisfied that there is nothing in Field Sports unfriendly to holiness, still he will consider whether their collateral effects are, *on the whole*, good, before he will decide in favour of his gun. George has mentioned one which he thinks good: and others, which may apply to the case of some gentlemen, though not to his, which would, in his opinion, be decisive *against* following those sports. There are also other effects which I think it will behove him to consider,—as the light in which a sporting clergyman is usually considered by the poor; the expence attending shooting and coursing, especially since the late tax has been imposed; and the example to other clergymen, who may not be so able to bear that expence, consistently with their duties, and particularly the duty of alms-giving in their parishes, or be so much inclined as George may be to pursue such seductive sports with moderation. Here again, if there appears room for hesitation, the rule will apply "what thou doubtest, do not."

The only remaining argument of George in favour of Field Sports is one, which he has not appeared to think deserving of more notice from him than it has received in a postscript of four lines. As he is not forward to press it into his service, I shall dismiss it very shortly. He asks how is game to be obtained? I suppose he means by gentlemen in his situation. Why, truly, Sir, if we never have any at our tables it will be no great matter. He who, when a point of duty was under his consideration, shewed so great a readiness to give up meat altogether, "I will eat no meat while the world standeth," would scarcely have asked the question how he and his fellow Christians should get game, if he had been called upon to decide respecting field diversions *.

I must remark, before I conclude, that the force of S. F. N.'s arguments and mine does not depend (as George seems to insinuate) on sportsmen "butchering as many unresisting creatures as possible." We (if S. F. N. will permit me to speak of myself as his ally on the present occasion), we point our arguments against butchering *any* creatures *for amusement*; and I suppose it will be allowed to be every sportsman's aim to carry home *some* in his bag. In using the term "butchering," I merely take the word of George without meaning to apply it in an invidious sense. The point under discussion must be determined, not by hard names, but by fair and calm reasoning.

T. R.

ON BANKRUPTS SUBSCRIBING TO CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

In our Number for January last it was asked, whether a certificated Bankrupt, who had not paid twenty shillings in the pound, was warranted in continuing his subscription to a society established on religious principles, and whether such a society could consistently receive his subscription? To these Queries an answer in the negative appeared in our Number for April, signed A. B. The arguments of A. B. were combated in the Number for June, by a correspondent who assumed the signature of Y. Z. We think it unnecessary to state the substance of these papers, as such of our readers as feel an interest in the discussion, may easily refer to them.

In consequence of the insertion of Y. Z.'s communication, we have been favoured with no fewer than eight letters intended to refute the positions of that writer. In one of them A. B. vindicates the reasoning employed in his first letter, and takes a full view of the laws respecting Bankrupts,

* I have purposely avoided the terms "lawful" and "expedient," employed by both the gentlemen who have preceded me on the present subject, as leading unnecessarily to verbal discussions.

supporting that view by a statement of adjudged cases, calculated to shew the erroneousness of his opponent's assertion, that a Bankrupt who has obtained his certificate "*ceases to owe.*" Into this detail we find it inconsistent with our limits to enter. It may be sufficient to say, that, to our apprehensions, A. B. appears to be better acquainted than Y. Z. both with the letter and spirit of our Bankrupt Laws. On the moral part of this subject, he observes, "I never understood that the forgiveness of an injury destroyed the obligation on the part of the person forgiven to make all the reparation in his power; though I admit that it cancels the injured party's right to claim reparation. An ingenuous disposition will feel the obligation more binding on himself from that very circumstance. *Right* and *obligation*, as between parties, are not always correlative: neither is it clear that the voluntary subscribers to a certificate can, in any case, acquit the Bankrupt of the moral obligation he is under to repair the evil which he has done to them."—"Y. Z. says likewise," continues A. B., "that my principle would carry me much further than I allow, as it would prevent my entering into the married state, and having children. It was never my intention to pursue the principle into detail, and enumerate all the cases to which it would justly apply; nor was it at all necessary: but really I should think the situation alone of an insolvent person sufficiently inauspicious to a matrimonial engagement, though he should not be under any sort of obligation whatever to pay money out of his future earnings. This kind of reasoning applies with equal force against the Creditors, who will not permit a person quietly to remain in their debt, so that he may marry and have children, but unmercifully cut up his conjugal prospects with a commission. Of the two obligations in question, that of paying twenty shillings in the pound being already in existence, the Bankrupt ought not, in my opinion, nor has he a right, to place himself under the other till this be discharged. If he were married previously to insolvency the case is different, and it will be no violation of any principle to allow maintenance to himself and family as a paramount obligation. Indeed, if Y. Z. had looked into some of the cases reported on this subject, he would have found that the labour of a Bankrupt for the maintenance of himself and his family is protected by law, and cannot be claimed by his assignees, *though he has not obtained his certificate.* To conclude, let me ask, Mr. Editor, whether my remarks, or those of Y. Z., are likely to produce the greater mischief to morals. He avows that he has written with a view of relieving the officers of public charities from the unpleasant, if not painful, task of refusing such subscriptions as I would reject. Admitting it to be a painful task, yet if necessary to a strict discharge of duty, this can be no reason for declining my remarks, but a very strong one for enforcing them to the utmost of my ability. How seldom is it that duty and inclination go together! How necessary, therefore, to strengthen the motives that lead to the discharge of the former when contrary to the latter."—"But it is further to be considered," adds A. B., "that Y. Z. lays out of his view the probable motives of those who subscribe the certificate; the particular circumstances which led to the Bankrupt's insolvency, (the things of all others that most concern the morality of the point at issue); and the case of those Creditors whose consent is withheld from the certificate; so that his intention of relieving their feelings is confessedly at the expence of their morality. But between the subscribers to charities and the receivers of the subscription there is a wide difference; for I by no means hold that the latter are bound to know the private affairs of the subscribers, and the case can seldom happen, in truth, where such an officer can be put upon the painful task of refusal. It can only occur, when he knows the fact, that the subscriber is circumstanced as stated in the Queries. This fact he can scarcely be certain of, so as to reject the subscription, unless he is himself a Creditor of the subscriber; and even then he may avoid the painful necessity of refusal, by placing it to account. But the fact must always be known to the subscriber; and his feelings ought to be roused to the performance of the prior, and therefore paramount, obligation, of paying twenty shillings in the pound."

Another correspondent who signs himself M. C. L. thus writes:

"When industrious Creditors have

been put into such a situation as to be forced to come and prove their debts, in order to procure a trifling dividend, if humanity should, notwithstanding the loss of the greater part of their just due, prompt them to sign the Bankrupt's Certificate out of compassion for the unhappy wife and children, to enable the man to begin to labour for their support; Y. Z. is pleased to call this a voluntary discharge, and to affirm that the Bankrupt is instantly released from all moral obligation to make good the deficiency.

"I can only say, that, for the credit of society, many who were not actuated by the superior motives of Religion, but merely conducted themselves agreeably to the laws of what is termed honour, have, years after their Bankruptcy, called their Creditors together and presented them, not only with the remaining part of the principal of their debts, but also with interest on them. Such conduct a dying pillow perhaps will deem not a work of supererogation, but of justice.

"Your correspondent's ideas of analogy do not seem very clear when he asks, "Where is the essential difference between a man directing by his will that the payment of a £1000. bond, which he holds from another shall not be enforced, and a Creditor signing the Certificate of a Bankrupt?" I answer, the former does the act without any request, and voluntarily releases the Debtor from the payment; the latter is always requested, nay, often importuned: the former, by his testamentary disposition, knowingly diminishes his estate by £1000.; the latter is sensible he loses nothing by his signature: the former, in fine, willingly and of his own accord, bequeathes the bond as a legacy; whereas, the latter is brought into his situation without his consent, and is forced by humanity for others, more than for the Bankrupt, to put his hand to an instrument that precludes him from any further prosecution of his debt.

"Y. Z.'s construction is very forced, indeed not warranted, when he asserts, that the Certificate, which is, in fact, a prevention of the Creditor "from enforcing his claims in the ordinary course," means a declaration that "the Debtor shall cease to owe." On the contrary, I maintain that, until full payment of a debt has been made, the moral obligation remains exactly the same, though the legal may not; a distinction your correspondent does not seem willing to acknowledge.

"But to reply to the two questions proposed, for elucidation, p. 30., in a more direct way than either A. B. or Y. Z. has done: I would say, in answer to the first query, that a man professing Religion or not, who has been a Bankrupt and has not paid twenty shillings in the pound, is by no means justified in continuing a subscription to any society for charitable purposes. 'Be just before you are generous,' is a sound precept, and the New Testament enjoins, 'Owe no man any thing.' To break the laws of the land every one knows is wrong; to fulfil the laws of the land all agree to be right. But there is another law which, if Y. Z. be a serious and devout character, he must acknowledge to be of still higher obligation, namely, the law of conscience: if he consults this he will find, that it will not allow him some practices which the law of the land does not prohibit. If a wealthy man, instead of bestowing his spare money for the relief of the necessitous, loses five guineas at cards, Y. Z. is in conscience obliged instantly to condemn the conduct, and I agree with him, though the law is silent upon the subject. But does not any Bankrupt who should, prior to his paying twenty shillings in the pound, give five guineas to a charity, however noble in its design and worthy of the most liberal support, divert the money from the right channel equally with the card-player? How does he know but that the money he gives *to* charities (for I will not allow his act to *be* charity) might, if given in proportion to his Creditors, have been of great service, and have come very opportunely to the succour and support of old age: which, owing to frequent losses from Bankruptcies, is deprived of the comforts arising from past industry.

"As to the second question, although no institution should *order* their collector to solicit subscriptions from persons well known to have been bankrupt, and not to have paid their Creditors in full,—as it would be laying a snare in the path of a liberal mind, yet if such persons offer a donation, I cannot see what power any

officer of a charity has of refusing money, unless a rule exists prohibiting those that have been declared insolvent from becoming members. The observation of A. B, if laid down as a general rule, 'that what a man cannot honestly give, a society therefore cannot either creditably or consistently receive,' certainly admits of a strong doubt. It is not the business of a charity to scrutinize the motives or the circumstances of any donor. If it were, testimonials would be needful for every subscriber. I think, at the same time, no one will affirm that a society can either creditably or consistently receive a Bankrupt as one of the managers of its concerns, or as a dispenser of its gifts. In that case, character and circumstances are objects highly proper for consideration."

A third correspondent, DISCIPULUS, takes the same side, and quotes in support of it a passage from Mr. Gisborne's Duties of Men. We shall extract from this letter one passage which somewhat varies the view taken by our two former correspondents of this subject.

"Had Y. Z. distinguished between legal and moral obligation, he would not have determined so confidently that a Certificate is an acquittal in every sense. The forgiveness of the Creditor has been incautiously confounded with the obligation of the Debtor. Were it granted, that 'the Certificate in effect and substance says, the Debtor shall cease to owe,' yet it may fairly be concluded, that a Debtor, whose conscience is regulated by the divine law, would qualify that indulgence to this effect. 'Though my Creditor relinquishes every claim upon me, having signed a Certificate as my legal discharge, yet as an accountable being to my conscience and to God, I feel myself still bound to liquidate every sum that remains due to my Creditors.' I will suppose a case, and put a question. A. owes B. a thousand pounds for goods bought of him. B. is a wealthy man. A. becomes a Bankrupt, and pays only 2s. 6d. in the pound. He obtains a Certificate, begins business again, succeeds far beyond his expectations, and in a few years realizes a good fortune. In the mean time B., though once rich, is reduced to great poverty, his possessions abroad being ravaged, plundered, and seized. I ask how ought A. to reason and act in this case. Suppose while A. is riding in his carriage he sees B. asking an alms. He immediately recollects having paid him £875. short of the sum he owed him, but consoles himself by reflecting with Y. Z., 'I am discharged from my debts,'—'I cease to owe.' This would be 'laying a flattering unction to his soul,' and would be crying peace, peace, while 'his gold and silver are cankering; the rust of which will witness against him, and eat his flesh as it were fire: it is heaping together treasure for the last days.' This supposition is more to me than a hundred metaphysical speculations in proving that Y. Z. is mistaken, and that A. B. has truth on his side. Moreover, I have one very strong appeal which is to matter of fact. The opinion of a large religious society, and the opinion and corresponding conduct of many individuals, should surely have great weight. In p. 222 of Christian Observer for April, the Quakers declare that 'no collection or bequests should be received of persons who have fallen short in the payment of their just debts, though legally discharged by their Creditors; for until such persons have paid their deficiency, their possessions cannot in equity be called their own.' So much for the decision of those who avowedly make morals a leading feature in their religious profession. But more than this; I know several men, and have heard of many more, who have paid their deficiencies with interest, whose conduct is always mentioned with high approbation; and why? because it is right. On the other hand, the omission of this when there is ability is almost universally execrated. I know a respectable man who, while walking from his house to London, sees his Debtor pass in his carriage who never made up his deficiency because, forsooth, 'his Creditors have discharged him.'

'Sunt qui in fortunæ jam casibus omnia ponant,
Et nullo credant mundum rectore moveri.
JUVENAL.'

Before we conclude, we feel ourselves called upon to express our surprise at the degree of warmth which has been introduced into this discussion. We have endeavoured to exclude, on the present occasion,

as well as when we inserted the letter of Y. Z., all offensive personalities, and acrimonious reflections; but yet we fear that we have not wholly succeeded. We should not have believed beforehand, that the present was a controversy likely to inflame the passions of the combatants.

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Life and Pontificate of Leo the Tenth. In Four Volumes. By William Roscoe. 4to. 1805. Liverpool, M'Creery; London, Cadell and Davies. Price £6. 6s.

It would be a difficult question to determine, what are the end and advantages, which the present generation of historians propose to themselves, in selecting history as the object of their labours. The *real* advantages of history are obvious: but these do not seem to enter into the view of the writers in question. For the advancement of truth they appear to have little concern, and still less for the advancement of morality or religion. On the contrary, it is to the subversion of these that their exertions are frequently directed. By persevering, however, in our inquiry, we shall at length find, that, generally speaking, the object of modern composers of history, as far as others are concerned, is to please. History is considered by them as a kind of theatre, upon which they are to exhibit those characters and events which are most likely to interest, and which will afford them an opportunity of displaying their talents as writers. The object therefore does not terminate in the pleasure of others: the pleasure which is communicated is returned to the source from which it flowed in a broad and copious current of fame and profit. Fame, a principle seldom allied with truth, the charm of history, is the avowed end of some who stand high in the class of historians: nor do they ever appear in a more degrading light than when they confess their subjection to this unworthy principle*. But something more substantial than fame has been found to be necessary to the happiness of authors, and even historians. Profit therefore is another, perhaps a principal, object with this voracious tribe. And when the sacrifice of truth, the patronage of vice, the accommodation to reigning opinions, the thin volumes, scanty pages, and profuse embellishments, which are to be observed in some of these writers, are duly considered, it will not be thought that they have neglected the means necessary to the attainment of their end. And for the heavy contributions, which they thus levy upon their readers, they may think it sufficient to apologize with the elegant metaphor which has been used by statesmen on the subject of taxes, alleging, that the contributors are adequately remunerated by the pleasure which they receive in return, as the moisture which is drawn from the earth by the clouds is restored to it in grateful and refreshing showers. A third reason of the predilection of some writers for the historic department is, and it ought not to be overlooked, the superior facility which it affords, to those who are so disposed, of perverting truth. No species of composition will enable an artful writer more completely to misrepresent facts, and principles connected with facts, without any express violation of truth. Truth may be beaten to death, in the Italian manner, with bags of sand, and no marks of external violence appear: or it may be destroyed by a slow poison periodically administered by the dexterous hand of an unprincipled historian.

These splendid volumes of Mr. Roscoe do not properly come under our notice, in any other view than as they occasionally glance on the subject of Religion, and particularly undertake to point out the causes, as well as relate the principal events, of the beginning of the Reformation; interspersing at intervals such reflections as it coincided with the author's views of that great revolution to make. With the lighter information, with which the

* See the Life of Robertson, by Dugald Stewart; and the flattering portrait drawn of Mr. Gibbon by his own pencil.

greater part of this work is occupied, we are little concerned: nor shall we grudge any of our readers the few hours they may employ in perusing the elegant pages of Mr. Roscoe, if the time be not stolen from more important engagements. Our official character forbids us to stop at trifles: we, therefore, without farther ceremony, overleap the first two volumes and commence our career in the third.

Mr. Roscoe begins his professed account of the Reformation at the 137th page of the third volume. According to the vulgar and sectarian apprehension of this revolution, he is pleased to term it a *schism:* his mistake, however, is entitled to the more indulgence, because he ought not to be suspected of being very deeply read in such authors as Hooker and Hall. No sooner does Mr. Roscoe enter upon this interesting period of history, than his nervous system undergoes a visible agitation, upon the view of the discord and persecution which always fill the prospect whenever he directs his eye to the Reformation, and in the guilt of which he seems to consider both the persecutors and the persecuted equally to participate. See p. 138. Our author, however, has not made intolerance the exclusive property of Christianity: he has fairly admitted, in contradiction to some of his associates, "the intolerant character of paganism." (p. 139.) We must express our obligations to him likewise for informing us, that Petrarch "in one of his sonnets assimilates the papal court to Babylon." (p. 140.)

We entirely agree with Mr. Roscoe in assigning, as one of the causes of the Reformation, the vices, and the exposure of the vices, of the Romish Clergy. His observations on their mixture of Paganism with Christianity, another cause of that great event, are ingenious and striking. In adding to the same class the prevalence of Platonism he may be partly right: but, in asserting that Platonism inculcates the pure unity of God in opposition to the doctrine of the Trinity, he will certainly not meet with the concurrence of those who would account for the introduction of this latter dogma into the Christian Church, by the encroachments of the theology of Plato. Independently, however, of the visible interposition of Providence in the great transactions which this writer attempts to account for, it will be evident to every one, who comes not wholly uninformed to the subject, that many of the most important predisposing, and immediate causes of the Reformation are either totally omitted, or very faintly adverted to. The sale of indulgences could not escape his notice: but he has failed to represent, in its true nature, the extreme iniquity of that impious traffic. It might be expected, that Mr. Roscoe would see no hand in the Reformation but that of man. Natural causes are those alone which he considers as operating, and by which alone he endeavours to account, for every event: yet so irresistible is the force of truth, that, when off his guard, he is compelled to acknowledge the extraordinary nature of the facts which he records; and apologizes for the want of foresight in Leo, by urging the extreme improbability of the events which took place. "How was it possible," he asks, "for Leo, unless he had been endowed with a greater portion of the prophetic spirit than had been conferred on any of his predecessors, to foresee that the efforts of an obscure monk, in a corner of Germany, would effect a schism in the hierarchy, which would detach from its obedience to the Roman see, one half of the Christian world?" (p. 157.)

The relation of Mr. Roscoe, in this part of his work, is tolerably correct, abating some harsh, and we must add insidious epithets, such as the "turbulent priest," applied to Luther, and reflections of a similar nature upon the various circumstances of the Reformation, and the persons concerned in promoting it.

At the close of this chapter, the 15th, our author points out two circumstances, to which, in his opinion, the success of Luther is principally to be attributed. The first is, the combining his cause with that of the promoters of literature. The fact is allowed: but a very natural question occurs, were the pretensions of Luther made with or without foundation? Is real literature, or is it not, necessarily connected with religious truth? Was the connection then made, or found and employed in his service, by the Reformer? If the pretensions were arbitrary and unfounded, why did not the opposite party

make the same? It would have been as easy and serviceable to the adherents of the prevailing Religion to combine their cause with the cause of literature, as it was to the patrons of the Reformation. The following passage, among many others, will furnish a proof of the difficulty of maintaining the appearance of candour, when the reality is wanting. "But Sadoleti, Bemlio*, and the rest of the Italian scholars, kept aloof from the contest, unwilling to betray the interests of literature by defending the dogmas of Religion; and left the vindication of the most important interests of the Church to scholastic disputants, exasperated bigots," &c. &c. The reader, doubtless, understands this language: he may likewise be amused to read the *earnest* and elegant address of Sadoleti to the Genevese, in order to recover them to the Catholic Communion, after the character with which Mr. Roscoe has honoured that respectable prelate. See that Address with Calvin's answer, in the last edition of the works of the latter author, Tom. VIII. pp. 99, &c.

The second circumstance to which Mr. Roscoe ascribes the success of Luther is his offering to submit his opinions to the test of reason and scripture. This, although not of itself an evidence of the justice and truth of his cause, was naturally to be expected if his cause *were* just and true. Our author has expatiated through a whole page upon the degradation which the Pontiff would have suffered, had he condescended to appeal to the same test. Notwithstanding the reiterated and imposing interrogatories of Mr. Roscoe, we conceive, that had Leo X. been able to promise himself any support from reason and scripture, he might have urged those arguments, not only with perfect decorum and dignity, but with considerable effect. At any rate he could not have exposed himself more than he did by that irrational, unscriptural, and puerile bull, which he was at length induced to fulminate against the Reformer. Mr. Roscoe thinks it of importance to finish the present chapter with a remark, which should bear the appearance at least of sagacity, and at the same time answer the still more important purpose of disparaging the Reformation. He considers himself justified, from the preceding detail, in asserting, that if Luther "had been Pope instead of Leo X. he would have defended the Church against a much more formidable adversary than the monk of Wittemberg." (p. 179.) That he was *qualified* so to do his whole history abundantly testifies; but that he would so have *employed* his qualifications is a position against which that whole history as decisively militates. Why should Mr. Roscoe suppose, that Luther would be more swayed by temporal motives, as Pope, than as the monk of Wittemberg? Why is it not as philosophical, as justly deducible from known phenomena, to suppose, that even on the papal throne he might have entertained the bold project of Reformation, as that he should meditate the same revolution in a monastery? There have been Popes themselves disposed, in some degree, to a Reformation of the Church, witness the very successor of Leo, Adrian VI. But he was hated, despised, opposed. Mr. Roscoe, as far as he was *misled* in the present supposition, was misled by the observation, that there are very few in elevated situations who pay a supreme regard to the dictates of conscience, and who pursue any schemes of reformation, contrary to their temporal interest, with sincerity or resolution. The fact arises, not so much from a change of principles upon their elevation, as from the circumstance, that the refusal to make such a change would, in general, be an effectual bar to their elevation. To suppose, therefore, that Luther, with his resolute, and especially his *conscientious*, character, would have been advanced, had other circumstances favoured the event, to the papal dignity; or that, contrary to all the principles which operate on such occasions, being so advanced he would have used his power to suppress that cause, which from conviction alone he had espoused, is to reason in a manner in which men never reason, when they have any interest in the truth. It is very evident to any impartial inquirer, that, had the Reformer been assailable on the side of his avarice or ambition, Leo and his adherents would have been well pleased to buy off the

* See a curious story of this infidel cardinal in Melch. Adam. Vit. Germ. Theol. p. 360. ed. 1653.

opposition of so formidable an enemy, with the highest dignities and emoluments, and such as would have amply satisfied the most exorbitant expectations or even wishes of an indigent monk.

The fourth volume of Mr. Roscoe's work undertakes, at the very beginning of it, to pursue the history of the Reformation. We are told, (p 7.), that Luther wrote to Tetzel, when sick, "intreating him 'to keep up his spirits, and to fear nothing from his resentment,' &c. *Luth.* op. in præf. Whether this was really intended as a consolation, the reader will judge." The honesty and generosity of Luther's character will leave no doubt of his intention in the mind of any impartial and informed reader, and the intention of Mr. Roscoe in this insinuation is equally obvious. In the same page this author, with a visible sympathy, observes respecting the differences between Luther and the Pope, that "the friends of peace began to flatter themselves that these disturbances would soon be amicably terminated." The attempt here, to throw the odium of breaking the peace upon the Reformer, is too manifest to escape any reader. And if we grant the evident assumption of Mr. Roscoe, that the point contended for was of little or no importance, there can be no doubt, that the imputation is just. For our own parts, we see so little reason to suspect the perfect indifference to truth on religious subjects, in those who profess or prove themselves to be unbelievers, that, without any violence to the most rigid principles of probability or candour, we can conceive, that, if the opportunity offered, they would embrace Popery with open arms; and feel well contented to have the pompous superstition, the tolerated immorality, and the licensed impiety, of that idolatrous religion restored in this kingdom. What shall we say of its spirit of persecution? Were not the mild Trajan and the elegant Pliny persecutors? Why should their admired examples want imitation, when the power to imitate is present?

Pp. 11—16. we have, almost at length in the text, and quite so in the original, in the Appendix, the letter of Luther to Leo, which, for the purpose of loading the Reformer with the greater odium, and of vindicating his hero, Mr. Roscoe insists, against some creditable authorities, was written on the 6th *April*, 1520, and therefore before the issuing of the famous bull, which is dated June 15, 1520. Mr. Roscoe supposes that this letter, which he has made to stand out from his work with all the prominence of a principal figure, has been omitted by Mosheim and Robertson with an interested view. *We* do not put so much importance upon the affair as to think, that they had any intention whatever in the omission, or that it was any thing but the insignificance of the letter, its insignificance as to the effect ascribed to it, which caused them to overlook it. The most suspicious bigotry could hardly affix such an imputation to the candid indifference of Dr. Robertson. It may not be improper, however, to give the matter some consideration; requesting only the permission to set aside the authority of Mr. Roscoe for the present, as he seems to have received a retaining fee from the Pope.

To the assertion of Mr. Roscoe, respecting the date of Luther's *contemptuous, insulting, offensive* letter, (so Mr. Roscoe pleases himself with characterizing it,) we shall oppose that of a professed writer upon the Reformation, and who, to talents of the highest rate as a critical historian, joined a minute and laborious attention to the particular history now concerned. We hardly need to name, although Mr. Roscoe appears to be unacquainted with him, the celebrated M. de Beausobre. His work is entitled, *Histoire de la Réformation, ou Origine et Progrès de Luthéranisme*, &c. In the second volume of that work, p. 8, or in the translation of it by Mr. Macaulay, which we shall quote, Vol. I. pp. 353, 354, the historian observes, that Miltitz and Luther, who had a conference on the subject of the reconciliation of the latter with the papal see, "came to an agreement that Luther should write to the Pope, in twelve days, a humble and submissive letter, under pretence of sending him a book he was employed upon, and that this letter should be dated the 6th of September, in order that it might not appear to be written since the arrival of the bull, or extorted through fear of excommunication." The letter, according to this account, must have been written some time after that date: and indeed not till after the

3rd of October, the date of a letter of Luther to Spalatinus, in which he said, that he had not then written the letter agreed upon. See Beausobre, p. 352*. Eckius had then arrived with the bull, but the publication of it in Saxony was violently opposed. Luther had not seen the bull in August; for his work, *de Capt. Bab.* was published in August, (Beausobre, p. 334, and 330,) and he had not then seen it, as Melchior Adam informs us. See Vitæ Germ. Theol. p. 114. His letter, therefore, might be written in time to obviate the execution of the bull, since the term allowed by it was one hundred and twenty days, to be reckoned from the time of its publication in Saxony †. In the works of Luther the letter is indeed dated the 6th April; and this might be done to make it appear to have been written before the bull itself was drawn up and dated. Luth. Opp. Tom. I. pp. 385—387, ed. 1612. The concurring testimony of Sleidan and Pallavicini, of which Mr. Roscoe endeavours to avail himself, may not improbably be resolved into that of the date in Luther's works. But our critic has likewise found "decisive internal evidence," that Luther's letter was written before "his final condemnation," as Mr. Roscoe terms it, by the Pope. The first proof is, that Luther cannot be supposed to have passed over in silence the papal bull, had it been issued when he wrote. By Beausobre's account, however, this very omission was designed. But if Mr. Roscoe's *decisive* argument is of any value, how is it, let him inform us, according to his own hypothesis of the order of these important writings, that the bull of Leo takes no notice of the Epistle of Luther? or if this should be deemed beneath the dignity of a bull, how is it that this same "provoking" epistle, an epistle which Mr. Roscoe would represent as justifying the measure of Leo, should be passed over in total silence in a confidential letter written by the Pope to the Elector Frederic, accompanying the bull which conditionally condemned his heretical subject, and dated, not a month after the bull itself, the 8th day of July? The other *decisive* argument to the same purpose, and by which, according to Mr. Roscoe, Seckendorf is shewn to be a year out in his account of the negotiations between the Reformer and Miltitz, is built upon the supposition, that all communication was terminated between them, when, by the issuing of the papal bull, Luther became "a declared heretic." If this argument had any weight it would apply to the conferences of 1519; for it appears, that in the year immediately preceding, the Bishop of Ascoli, auditor of the Apostolic chamber, the Pope's agent, *ch'è*, says Pallavicini, *l'ordina-*

* Such is the argument of the laborious and celebrated Seckendorf. He adds, which Mr. Roscoe does not dissemble, that the German translation of this letter bears date the 6th of September. The chapter of the Augustinians, which endeavoured to induce Luther to write the proposed epistle, was assembled the 28th of August of this year. Luther wrote to Spalatinus on the subject the 11th of September, and again, as is mentioned above, on the 3d of October. This able writer justly observes that Pallavicini should have sought the original of Luther's letter in the Vatican. Comm. Hist. et Ap. de Luth. l. 1. § 67, pp. 150—152. ed. 1688. See likewise Sleidan, Comment. &c. Tom. I. p. 91, ed. 1785, with the note. Another letter of Luther's was ante-dated; and likewise the bann of the empire against him. See Pallavic. Ist. del Conc. di Trent. l. 1. c. vii. p. 68. and c. xxviii. p. 169. This Popish author, who from uniting with him in every thing hostile to the Reformation, is, and ought to be, regarded by Mr. Roscoe with peculiar complacency, evidently confutes both himself and Mr. Roscoe. He affirms that Miltitz spent about two years in endeavouring to reclaim Luther (consumando quasi due anni in quell' impresa) l. 1. c. xviii. p. 114; and he arrived in Germany after the 12th of January, 1519. Sleidan, Comm. Tom. I. p. 62.

† The Italian historian of the Council of Trent furnishes the means of ascertaining when the bull was published in Saxony. At the Diet of Worms, 1521, Alcander procured another bull, che poi uscì a' tre di Gennaio; dove Lutero non sotto condizione della sua perseverante disubbienza, comme nella passata, ma con *assoluta* maniera, poichè il termino prescrittogli gia era trascorso; fosse dichiarato Eretico. This it was said would take away the pretence, that Luther was never condemned absolutely by the Church, (condamnato *assolutamente*) l. 1. c. xxv. p. 139. Reckoning back the term of one hundred and twenty days from the 3d (Mosheim says the 6th) of January, we shall come to the time when the former bull was published, which was about the day or the day after the date of Luther's letter, Sept. 6, 1520.

rio esecutore di tutti le pontificie ordinazioni, had pronounced him to be an obstinate heretic. See Sleidan, Comment. &c. l. 1. Tom. I. pp. 36, &c. Milner, Vol. IV., Part I., pp. 338, 339; Pallavic. Ist. del Conc. di Trent. l. 1. c. vi. pp. 66, 67, and c. ix. pp. 76, 77 *. This is said upon the supposition of our author: but his statement is incorrect. Luther was *not* declared a heretic by the bull in question. Had Mr. Roscoe read that bull with any attention, or had not relied upon the common abridgement of it, as he appears to have done, although it is inserted at length in his Appendix, he would have seen that sixty days are allowed to Luther, within which he and his associates were to desist ("*desistant*") from the publication of their errors, and sixty more within which he was to recant them ("*revocet*"): these one hundred and twenty days to be reckoned from the affixing of the bull on the Church doors in several parts of Germany; and that upon his non-performance of these terms within the appointed time, and *not till then*, was Luther to be denounced as a heretic, and suffer the sentence of excommunication.

As this is the only place, in his account of the Reformation, in which Mr. Roscoe has hazarded a criticism, we conceived it of importance to give our readers a specimen of his abilities in that department of literature.

In p. 23, Mr. Roscoe speaks of the hostile spirit of Protestants and Papists, as if, whenever there is a difference, both the contending parties must of course be equally wrong. From p. 32 to 36 we have an account of the Diet of Worms, in which will be discovered a sally of candour in favour of Luther, easily to be accounted for, when it is considered, that, without such an occasional display of impartiality, his misrepresentations would be deprived of their effect; and when it is further considered, that the infamy of a person is secure, if what is bad as well as what is good is believed of him †. The account is given with spirit, but, in our opinion, is inferior both in interest and propriety to the same transaction as related by Beausobre.

Mr. Roscoe has caught both the spirit and the phraseology of the Papists, when he talks of "the new opinions," (p. 41; see likewise Vol. III. p. 138,) and in one of his pleasant strokes concerning the *elegantiæ* of religious controversy, where he quotes two passages sufficiently gross from Luther and Sir Thomas More, (p. 42,) he seems to have forgotten, that the Papist has much the advantage over the Protestant, the Laic over the Ecclesiastic, the Lawyer over the Divine. In truth, both Luther and Sir Thomas More would have written in very different language, *although with precisely the same feelings and intentions*, had they lived in the eighteenth or nineteenth century. We are taught by our present instructor in Ecclesiastical History, that "the doctrine of Predestination was first advanced by Austin, in consequence of what he had maintained in the Pelagian controversy, on the subjects of *grace* and *original* sin:" and for this piece of information we are referred to Dr. Priestley's History of the Christian Church. We shall expect in future to see Baronius referred to in proof of the discovery of the real cross, or Thomas Paine quoted as authority on the subject of libels.

Before Mr. Roscoe indulged himself in the observation, that Luther "impeached the authority of one of the Apostles;" (p. 50.) when he rejected the Epistle of St. James he should have proved, that, while he rejected it, he still admitted it to be the production of that Apostle ‡. We

* This happened even before the conferences at Augsburg with Cajetan, whom Mr. Roscoe chuses to call the Cardinal of Gaeta. His proper name is Tomasso di Vio, Cardinal di Gaeta or Gaetano. Yet in his letters to the Pope he latinizes his name, and subscribes himself Caietanus. See Lettere di Principi. Mr. Roscoe, therefore, might have been contented with the common name.

† An observation in the Pensées de Pascal may be referred to this reflection. Cette maîtresse d'erreur, que l'on appelle *fantaisie* et *opinion*, est d'autant plus fourbe, qu'elle ne l'est pas toujours: car elle seroit regle infaillible de vérité, si elle l'étoit infaillible du mensonge; mais étant le plus souvent fausse, elle ne donne aucun marque de sa qualité, marquant de même caractere le vrai et le faux. pp. 154, 155. ed. 1783; or chap. xxv. § 4. See likewise a paper "On the Occasional Candour of Anti-christian writers," Christ. Observ. Vol. for 1802, p. 298.

‡ This he did not; for he denied its genuineness; how weak soever his reason for so doing might be, is nothing to the pur-

will not detain our readers with any remarks on the reasoning which occurs, p. 52; and which would suit either of the convertible characters of the mystic and the infidel. The sagacious doubt, p. 58, may safely be left to its full effect; and respecting "the odious and absurd institutions of monastic life," (p. 59), we leave this redoubtable champion to break a lance with Mr. Malthus.

Our author has chosen to inform his readers of the estimation in which he holds the Réformation, when he represents the example of freedom of inquiry, which it set, as its most important advantage. Although we neither are, nor would be understood to be, enemies to freedom of inquiry, we cannot forbear remarking, that no one circumstance attending the Reformation was more extensively abused, and, in the abuse, produced more serious mischief, than the liberty which our author so extravagantly extols; and that had it not been for the various and powerful correctives which the Reformation supplied to the natural tendency of this dangerous acquisition, the Reformation would have been, and perhaps would still be, an event to be deplored.

Pp. 60 and 61 bring us to the wars and persecutions consequent upon the Reformation, which always seem to be recollected and celebrated with complacency, whenever a fit opportunity for introducing them occurs. We have only to ask, on this subject, who were active? who were passive?

But our author's humanity cannot be confined within the limits of the text: it overflows in a large expanse of note, and still extending its copious streams, discharges its last effusions in the Appendix. The occasion was tempting. The burning of Servetus rose full in his view, and seemed to reflect dishonour upon the Reformation. The vision was too enchanting not to be pursued with ardour, and, if possible, embraced. The affair is introduced with a remark of Bishop Warburton, that the persecuting spirit of the Papists was transferred to the Reformers. We could refer this zealot *against* the Reformation to another passage in the same writer, distinguished by the same spirit and sobriety, in which Luther himself is reviled as being actuated by avarice in his opposition to Popery. "We bless the hand which turned the avarice of a furious friar, and the luxury of a debauched monarch, from their natural mischiefs, to become instruments of the choicest blessings." Sermons, Vol. II. p. 142. We consider ourselves as entitled to the gratitude of Mr. Roscoe for pointing out this passage to him: we must observe, however, that the great but hasty prelate, upon subsequent and cooler reflection, when he transcribed these words into the ninth book of the Divine Legation, in the notes, thought proper to insert after the word *avarice*, "if such was the case." See Supplemental Volume, p. 336. We flatter ourselves that Mr. Roscoe himself will approve this hesitating clause, since he has consulted the credit of his general associates, by totally omitting the foolish story which gave rise to this exploded calumny. See Robertson's Charles V., and Maclaine in a note on Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. But to come to Servetus. Mr. Roscoe observes, "the annals of persecution cannot furnish a more atrocious instance of bigotry and cruelty, than the burning of Servetus, in a Protestant city and by Protestant priests." We beg to suggest the suspicion, a suspicion for which this passage at least affords sufficient ground, that Mr. Roscoe is but very slightly read in the annals of persecution; or he could not have thrown the reins upon the neck of his zeal so imprudently, as to make an assertion, which can hardly fail to suggest its own confutation. Can Mr. Roscoe have forgotten the myriads of instances of persecution by the Romanists, most of which, in all their circumstances, were more atrocious than this most atrocious one? Sanguine authors are very apt to overlook the force of superlative expressions: but is Mr. Roscoe yet to be informed of the long reign and the truculent deeds of the inquisition? Is he now to learn, that no less than one hundred thousand persons fell by the hands of the executioner in the various persecutions carried on by Charles V.?—a fact, asserted by the correct Grotius, although ridiculously as well as maliciously misunderstood by Edward Gibbon. But there are some minds, of sensibili-

pose. For a *fair* account of this matter see Bayle himself, Dict. Art. *Luther*; not Mr. Roscoe's representation of that author.

ties so peculiarly constituted, as to be thrown into convulsions at the view of inferior acts of cruelty, and yet to repose with indifference, or, which is only an apology for the same thing, with an affected incredulity, upon the most barbarous and most extensively destructive deeds which human malignity has ever perpetrated. There is a picture drawn by the diamond pen of Mr. Burke, which almost involuntarily presents itself to us on this occasion. "They seemed tame, and even caressing. They had nothing but *douce humanité* in their mouth. They could not bear the punishment of the mildest laws on the greatest criminals. The slightest severity of justice made their flesh creep. The very idea that war existed in the world disturbed their repose. Military glory was no more, with them, than a splendid infamy. Hardly would they hear of self-defence, which they reduced within such bounds, as to leave it no defence at all. All this while they meditated the confiscations and massacres we have seen. Letter to a noble Lord, p. 58. We are very far from wishing to insinuate that the conduct of Calvin, in the affair of Servetus, does not, in itself considered, merit the utmost severity of censure: but unquestionably the comparative character given to it by Mr. Roscoe is altogether unjust.

Not to dwell upon the various rhetorical exaggerations of Mr. Roscoe, it may be proper to remind the reader, as this author, unless he were ignorant of the fact, has judged it expedient *not* to do, that Calvin has himself given an account of this affair; and although the evidence of a party ought to be received with caution, none but the advocates of summary convictions will contend that it ought not to be received at all. The account of Calvin is contained in the eighth volume of his works, pp. 510, &c. He here disclaims any thing further than procuring the imprisonment of Servetus: and he asserts, that, had Servetus chosen to retract his heresy, he might have saved his life. It appears that this unhappy man was a gross Pantheist, that he impugned the divinity of our Saviour, and that he was possessed of extreme impudence. His *nebulo pessime*, and his *mentiris*, which occur so frequently, as applied to Calvin, are a sufficient proof of this last disposition. Calvin has, in this piece, attempted to vindicate the use of the sword in matters of Religion, by arguments which happily will not approve themselves to the judgment of modern times, and are certainly wholly incompatible with the tolerant spirit of the Gospel. Mr. Roscoe has found it for his purpose to adduce part of a MS. history of Servetus, cited by Allwoerden in an account of that unfortunate man: but its accuracy may fairly be questioned, since it attributes to him at his death these words, *Jesu, Fili Dei æterni miserere mei*; whereas Calvin, in his account, subscribed by the ministers and pastors of the Church of Geneva, asserts, that, at the stake, he pertinaciously refused to invoke the eternal Son of God, *æternum Dei Filium invocare pertinaciter renueret*. The words are not exactly alike, but they are sufficiently so to make it extremely improbable that both accounts are true. Calvin alleges the perturbation and horror with which Servetus received and suffered his sentence, together with his offering no defence of the doctrines for which he was condemned, to prove that he ought not to be considered as a martyr. Mr. Roscoe seizes this tempting opportunity to inveigh against the inhumanity of Calvin: but whether Servetus was a martyr or not, seems to us a question of fact, not of humanity. But it is not sufficient to satisfy Mr. Roscoe that the disgrace of this act should attach to Calvin alone. Melancthon it seems had approved it: but neither will this additional victim suffice: the whole body of the Reformers, the whole fabric of the Reformation must share in the dishonour. "Such," says our author, alluding to Melancthon, "such were the sentiments of the *mild and candid* Melancthon, and such the *first fruits* of that *Reformation*, which professed to assert the right of private judgment in matters of Religion, and to enlighten and humanize mankind!" That persecution should be represented as the *fruit* of the Reformation seems incorrect, as persecution certainly existed before; and that, in the sense of a proper and genuine effect, it was the fruit of the Reformation appears to us an assertion no better founded, than it would be to call the fanatical impiety and ferocious anarchy which France has exhibited, the fruits of philosophy and

liberty. But whether persecution be the fruit or not of the Reformation, it is by a very bold figure indeed, that the particular act alluded to is represented as the *first* fruits. The Reformation began in the year 1517: the execution of Servetus happened in 1553, thirty-six years difference. This, it must be admitted, was a tolerable time for such powerful and active principles, as the Reformation gave birth to, to produce their *first* fruits. We, at least, had conceived, that "the turbulent priest" had not gone quietly to his grave, before the revolution which he had effected was followed by some important consequences, and even by some which would have perfectly suited Mr. Roscoe. But *did* the Reformers, as Mr. Roscoe affirms, "assert the right of private judgment in matters of Religion?" We believe not—not absolutely and without limitation. Not an instance, we apprehend, can be brought, in which they professed to tolerate the public denial or oppugnment of fundamental doctrines, particularly the divinity of Christ.

Although nothing can be farther from our principles and intentions than to vindicate persecution, yet we can easily conceive the temptation which religious persons may feel to be guilty of it. Their high value of truth, their supreme love to God, make them feel any insult offered either to the one or the other, as a man would feel any injury committed against a good and affectionate parent. If the offence cannot be discontinued without the death of the offender, here is a temptation; a temptation indeed to be resisted, but still a temptation. Little praise is due to those who are exempt from the temptation, purely and solely from the utter absence of religious principle. Nay, there are persons who, though little disposed to persecute on account, or rather in favour *, of Religion, yet are ready enough to do so, when the gratification of avarice or of any other passion is concerned. In what other light are the slave trade, duelling, and some legal proceedings to be viewed?

In extenuation, however, of the spirit of persecution, justly chargeable, in some degree, upon the Reformers, be it observed, that they only took their part in a general error †, and that considerably mitigated ‡. And with respect to the wound, intended to be given through their sides to Christianity itself, it is enough to say, that the truth and nature of Christianity have never depended upon the character of its professors; so that, however unworthily they may have conducted themselves, it is from the religion itself, and from that alone, that its real nature is to be known.

The apparent complacency with which Mr. Roscoe has dwelt upon this disgraceful and tragical event almost justifies us in suspecting, that it was not more satisfactory to its author, as far as he was the author, on the mistaken ground of its being necessary to the honour of religion, than it is to the present commentator upon it, on account of the disgrace which it seems to reflect immediately upon the Reformation, and ultimately upon Christianity itself.

* For *against* Religion the persecuting spirit is as active and powerful in men of no principle as in the most ferocious bigots; and which is a curious circumstance, this is often peculiarly the case with those whose conscience has experienced some alarm, and whose natural and just fears, respecting another life, have been excited. In this case their natural dislike to Religion is heightened by provocation. It is a mistake to imagine, that infidels, or as they chuse to call themselves, philosophers, are free from religious, and even superstitious, terrors. Bayle, under the article Hobbes, has endeavoured, in a very philosophical manner, to prove, that, from their principles, Atheists, of all men, have the least cause to doubt the phenomena of apparitions. The weak and unhappy philosopher of Malmsbury was much subject to alarms on this head; and such we may justly suspect is the case of other philosophers. The following lines, in one of Pope's Moral Essays, are remarkable:

That gay Freethinker, a fine talker once,
What turns him now a stupid silent dunce?
Some god, or *spirit*, he has lately found;
Or chanced to meet a minister that frown'd.

† So general was this sentiment at the time of the Reformation, that even Servetus, when under sentence of death, in one of his letters from his prison, says, that had he been justly chargeable with denying the immortality of the soul, he would condemn himself to death.

‡ Let the number of individuals who suffered in Protestant and in Popish persecutions be compared: let the five years reign of our Queen Mary be compared with all the Protestant reigns put together.

We shall be detained but a short time longer by Mr. Roscoe. In his last chapter, which is devoted to the white-washing of Leo, we are taught that the only difference in ecclesiastical establishments is, whether an individual take his faith from a Pope, from Calvin, from Luther, or Henry VIII., &c. p. 320. Now, that the opinions prescribed by these respective heads of Churches are precisely the same, will scarcely be asserted; and that they are each arranged with such mathematical accuracy, that they are all at a distance exactly equal from truth, seems to be hardly a more rational hypothesis. We think, in some cases at least, there is a difference, discernible and demonstrable, between truth and falsehood, between morality and vice, between religion and impiety. That many things are doubtful is not less certain. But to lay it down as an axiom, that in conforming with any Church we must of course only chuse one error instead of another, is scarcely more rational than to say, that we must be right if we dissent from all.

Mr. Roscoe is obliged to acknowledge his holiness, Leo X., to have been guilty of great atrocities, to have been peculiarly addicted to buffoons, and to have lived as a *bon vivant*, or a voluptuary. Yet, as in most little sects, the holding the tenets, by which they are peculiarly distinguished, is considered as supplying the place of all other merit; so, the patronage which this pontiff gave to elegant literature, is, in the eyes of his panegyrist, the sponge which wipes out all his crimes, and the title upon which he is advanced to one of the highest thrones in the pantheon of illuminized worthies.

We have only to add, that this work is certainly a highly embellished and entertaining performance. Information of any considerable importance it neither promises nor gives. Those incidents in the history of the Reformation, which are not distorted by the prejudices of the writer, are elegantly detailed: but no one would think of looking for a complete or adequate account of that interesting period in Mr. Roscoe's production. What he has given his readers, (always excepting his misrepresentations,) may be considered as the prominent figures only in the piece, the *Beauties* of the Reformation. Let the man who would understand the history of this important revolution, read Sleidan, or Seckendorf, or Beausobre, or Milner; from the last of which writers we shall hope speedily to have the remaining portion of the history of the Reformation presented to the public, distinguished, like the former, by a constant attention to modern prejudices and misrepresentations.

The character which Mr. Roscoe has sustained in this performance is uniform and yet various; uniform, as it appears to us, in his hostility to Christianity; various, in personating, at one time a Papist, at another a Protestant, at another a mystic; to say nothing of the far more frequent occasions on which he appears in his true character. We mean no reflection upon the humanity of Mr. Roscoe: nevertheless that quality always appears to be called forth into the most vivid exercise, when a sentiment dishonourable to Christianity is likely to be the consequence. Where the reasonings or insinuations of this writer produce any effect, it is generally to be ascribed to the variance which exists between the apparent intention and the real assertion; and, in this circumstance, his success resembles the advantage, which a fencer, with a cast in his eye, has over his antagonist. In short, Mr. Roscoe never proves himself so irrefragable and triumphant a doctor, as when his readers hardly know what he means: he never carries his cause so completely, as when he has extinguished the difference between right and wrong, and rendered them convertible terms.

Nott's *Sermons on Enthusiasm.*

(Continued from p. 363.)

The second discourse treats of Scepticism. Our readers will form a correct idea of the author's sentiments and reasoning, when we have observed that he occupies the same ground with Mr. Daubeny and his followers. Having already expressed our opinion on this subject, in our review of that gentleman's works, it is the less necessary that we should enter fully into this part of the volume. (See particularly Christian Observer, Vol. for 1804, p. 481—484; and for 1805, pp. 160—162.) We continue to think, that we should

not be justified in adopting conclusions unfavourable to the moral character of any individual, merely because he differs from us on points concerning which the Scriptures do not speak with that degree of precision, which is calculated to remove the doubts of well intentioned and upright men. The spirit of our Reformers was truly liberal; they endeavoured (and we think successfully) to ascertain what form of Church Government was the most agreeable to Scripture, and the most conformable to primitive usage. But while we admire that constitution, which was the happy result of their labours, we admire also that Christian candour which led them to allow a participation of Gospel privileges to other Churches, who, though differing from themselves in the mode of outward discipline, adhered to all the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. It is, undoubtedly, incumbent on us, as Christians, to allow that liberty of judgment to others which we claim for ourselves; and even were our duty, in this respect, less obvious than it is, yet we are convinced, that the cause of our excellent establishment is better promoted by dispassionate reasoning, and candid discussion, than by the violence of invective or the intolerance of party zeal.

Mr. Nott seems to have been sensible of the uncharitable aspect of his opinions. It is curious and pleasing to observe the apparent struggle between the rigour of his avowed sentiments and the native candour of his mind: witness the following exercise of his charity in favour of the Scotch and other foreign Churches.

"We are fully persuaded therefore, that as fine gold cometh purer from the fire, so the cause of our Establishment, the more it passeth the severe ordeal of investigation, will be found more and more to justify our adherence to it. But, though we assert our own fidelity, we presume not to judge those, who, countenanced by the solemnity of deliberate and national decisions, have thought it best to adopt a different communion. That they have abandoned the one Apostolical Church is too true. But if they did it not to gratify a spirit of party, or of pride; and if they have approved themselves to be in other points generally pure in faith, and illustrious in obedience, shall we prescribe bounds to God's forgiveness? Charity forbid! Believing that mercy may be extended to any offence, that proceeds not from an heart of malice, with a feeling of inexpressible joy we look forward to a moment, when, sitting down in the kingdom of Heaven with the faithful of other communions, we shall praise with one mouth that Saviour, whom with one heart we have loved; evermore rejoicing that the frailty of human nature no longer interferes to prevent that perfect unity, which when it shall be established upon earth in the external Church, *every valley shall be then exalted, every mountain shall be then laid low, and an high way prepared for the coming of our God* *." (p. 125, 126.)

We have here an instance of the difficulties to which those writers are reduced, who, in their definition of a Christian Church, regard discipline as its distinguishing characteristic. He who considers the Church of Christ merely as a visible communion, united by a divinely prescribed form of worship and discipline, is reduced to this dilemma: he must either unchristianize all whose ecclesiastical forms differ from his own, or he must qualify his opinions by exceptions which are subversive of his premises. If any particular form of Church Government be indeed of the same manifest and exclusive obligation, as some contend, with Christianity itself, no national decisions, however solemn and deliberate, can justify a departure from it; and, consequently, thousands and tens of thousands of his Majesty's Protestant subjects, with all those Christian Churches whose forms of government do not agree with the alleged standard, are involved in a charge which admits of no extenuation. Supposing a national synod were solemnly and deliberately to adopt a Socinian Creed, would the denial of the Lord that bought them be less criminal, because they had acted in a collective, and not in an individual capacity? Surely not. Where the question respects a plain appointment of the Almighty, the weight of numbers can confer no sanction on the breach of it. It is needless to observe, that there must be some radical defect in the reasoning which leads to such untenable conclusions. Every difficulty, however, as it appears to us, would be avoided by adhering to the mild and conciliating sentiments of the venerable Fathers of the Church. We must refer our readers to our Volume for 1804, pp. 481—484, for a distinct

* Isaiah xl. 3, 4.

view of their opinions on this subject*; and we cannot omit this opportunity of expressing our regret, that there appears to be an increasing departure from their candid and liberal spirit, in many of those who profess to be the most zealous adherents of the Church. The unqualified positions of Mr. Nott, (p. 116), are indeed little more than a transcript of those which the adherents of the Romish Church urged in opposition to our first Reformers.

But what connection, it may be asked, has Schism with the professed subject of these sermons? Let our author be heard in reply.

"Having framed a new doctrine, the Enthusiast will proceed to frame a new establishment. He will plead, that the same commission which entitled him to teach, will entitle him to govern. In consequence of which, he will do far worse even than the sons of Corah†: for he will not merely arrogate the priesthood to himself, but he will frame a new one after his own conceits; he will invent strange ordinances, and will call them God's appointed means of grace: he will persuade simple ones that salvation is to be found within the limits of that fold, which he has without authority created; and, as far as human means can operate, he will destroy the Church of Christ, by violating its Unity." (p. 77.)

We have here the same objection to make which we urged under a preceding head. The view which the author takes of the subject is far too partial and contracted. For whatever truth there may be in his representation, when applied to the ambitious leader of a separate communion, it certainly cannot be applied, with any justice, to Enthusiasts. In general, few comparatively have the talents or the means for founding a sect, and it is therefore injudicious to consider that as a branch, or necessary consequence, of Enthusiasm, which must, in its nature, so rarely occur. We question, indeed, whether a blind bigotry and devotion to a party be not found combined with Enthusiasm, far more frequently than the ambition of becoming the leader of a sect. There have been multitudes of Enthusiasts in the Church of Rome who never were guilty of Schism, but, on the contrary, were unalterably attached to that communion. Even our own Church has furnished many similar instances of Enthusiasts, who have lived and died within her pale. Besides, were the view which Mr. Nott takes of the subject correct, it would be impossible for the enthusiastical leader of a sect to attach to himself any number of enthusiastical followers: a conclusion which is completely disproved by experience. When we consider all these circumstances, it appears to us that our author's hypothesis is fundamentally erroneous; and that Enthusiasm has no *necessary* connection either with Schism, or with the ambition of being the head of a new sect.

In the three succeeding discourses, the principles advanced in the two first Sermons are illustrated by the cases of Messrs. Whitfield and Wesley. The object of the third discourse is to prove, that those leaders were guilty of Schism; of the fourth, that their Schism originated in Enthusiasm: and of the fifth, that their Enthusiasm was engendered by a spirit of pride and ambition. All these positions are attempted to be proved by copious extracts from the writings of those gentlemen and their biographers.

The author has, in part, we think, substantiated his charges. Understanding by Schism, a separation from the Church of England, he has proved that such a separation has taken place. By a great number of quotations he has also made it appear that those di-

* "Blessed be God," says Bishop Hall, that able defender of Episcopacy, "there is no difference in any *essential* matter betwixt the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation."—"The *only difference* is in the form of outward administration; wherein also we are so far agreed, as that *we all profess this form not to be essential to the being of a Church*, though much importing the well or better being of it, according to our several apprehensions thereof; and that we do all retain a reverent and loving opinion of each other, in our own several ways, not seeing any reason why *so poor* a diversity should work any alienation of affection in us one towards another." (*Peace-maker*, Ed. 1645, p. 47.)

"Though episcopal government," observes the pious Bishop Andrews, "be of divine institution, yet it is not so absolutely necessary as that there can be no Church, nor sacraments, nor salvation without it. He is blind that sees not many Churches flourishing without it; and he must have a heart as hard as iron that will deny them salvation." (*Bingham's French Churches Apology*, p. 45.)

† Numbers xvi. Jude 11.

vines, on not a few occasions, both acted and wrote under the influence of Enthusiasm. But when he would represent them as acting habitually and uniformly under such an influence; when he would persuade us also that pride and ambition were the main springs of all their plans and pursuits; we think that he has pushed his conclusions much farther than his premises will warrant. It is one thing to assert that corrupt passions occasionally influence the mind; and another that they so reign within it as to govern the whole life and conduct. The former supposition may be admitted even with respect to persons who possess, in the main, a Christian spirit: but the latter is utterly incompatible with all claim to the Christian character. The heart in which pride or ambition has an absolute and habitual ascendency, cannot be actuated by the principles of the Gospel; because it is not possible that selfish and worldly aims should *predominate* in the soul which is renewed in the image of Christ. To admit, therefore, the justice of the charges, which Mr. Nott has so elaborately exhibited against the moral character of these two divines, would not only be inconsistent with that charity, which "hopeth all things," and with the concessions which Mr. Nott himself has occasionally made respecting their general excellence; but, on the supposition that these concessions are just, would go to contradict the plainest principles of Religion. For, if it be true, as Mr. Nott admits, that they were *pious* men, then it is absolutely impossible that they could have lived under the *predominant* influence of pride and ambition; for piety necessarily implies a *predominant* regard to the will of God.

Our limits will not suffer us to enter minutely into the various particulars brought forward in the text, and elucidated in the notes with which this part of Mr. Nott's volume is crowded. We beg leave, however, to make a few observations, suggested to us by a general view of the manner in which the whole subject is discussed by our author.

First, then, we think that the confessedly excellent points in the characters of Messrs. Whitfield and Wesley are too studiously concealed. Their defects only are exhibited, and these with such prominence that a reader, who should derive all his knowledge of them from the volume before us, would find it difficult to rest in any other conclusion than this, that they were not only Enthusiasts, but ambitious designing impostors*. We grant that the task which the author had imposed on himself, of pointing out their faults, precluded him, in a great measure, (as he himself observes, p. 316), from the contemplation of their virtues; but still, where there was so much, (as he admits) to commend, care should have been taken not to magnify their defects to such a degree as to fill the eye of the observer. In his zealous endeavours to expose error and delusion, he should have been careful to do justice to true and solid worth. We admit, indeed, that this was not compatible with an attempt to prove that pride and ambition were the chief, if not the sole, springs of their conduct; which, were it true, would more effectually unchristianize them, in our view, than any proof which could be adduced of their separation from the Church of England. For this reason we regret that such an attempt should have been made, both because it is inconsistent with the candid and liberal sentiments which adorn some of our author's pages, and because it appears to us inconsistent with truth. When it is considered that for a long course of years those divines continued their labours unwearied; that with undeviating perseverance they preached repentance towards God, and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, in the face of contempt and persecution; that their industry in their pious work is unparalleled in modern times: when it is further considered, that, in the prosecution of this work, they were honoured with unexampled success in the actual reformation of the moral state of thousands of the la-

* We cannot help thinking, that there is a great want of consistency in the view which Mr. Nott has taken of the characters of Whitfield and Wesley. If they really were Enthusiasts, then they must have believed that they were acting under a divine impulse; and, however they may have deceived themselves, they must be acquitted of any *design* to deceive others. On the other hand, if their plans were artfully laid, with a view to their own aggrandizement; if this object were systematically pursued from early youth to mature age; they must then have been wilful deceivers, and not Enthusiasts.

bouring poor; that all the energy of their souls appears to have been directed to this grand object; and that they did not relax for a moment until disabled by sickness or removed by death: when all these things are considered, we should pause before we grant the probability, or even the possibility, of their having been *chiefly* influenced by a spirit of pride and ambition. That a very blameable spirit *occasionally* prevailed in their bosoms, and hurried them forward to write and speak many things inconsistent with that temper of charity, sobriety, and meekness, which is a Christian Minister's highest praise, we allow: but that from their earliest years they acted under the base influence of the passions attributed to them; that, impelled by ambitious views, they considered themselves as destined for the ministry; that they actually assumed sacred orders under the same influence; and that pride suggested the line of conduct which they adopted in after life; are assertions from which a regard to christian charity, and to biographical truth, compels us to withdraw our assent.

2. Though the charge of Enthusiasm has certainly been proved against them in a variety of instances, yet, in some very important points, our author's conclusions are stronger than the facts adduced by him will warrant, and sufficient discrimination has not been used in tracing out the lineaments of delusion. The task, we allow, was difficult; there being danger "lest in gathering up the tares, the wheat also should be rooted up with them." This danger, we do not think that our author has escaped. In his endeavours to eradicate the weeds and prune the luxuriancies of the Christian Garden, he appears to us to have done some injury to the true plants. An instance or two will illustrate our observation. Thus, in p. 269, Mr. Nott observes, that a "love of praise and distinction existed in their minds, and influenced their conduct, from their earliest years. The belief which they entertained, almost in infancy, of being destinated to the accomplishment of some great event; and the expectation which they encouraged of receiving some commission from the Almighty, could only have proceeded from a pre-disposition of the heart to wish that such an honour might be conferred upon them." Now, when this observation is produced to support a weighty charge, affecting materially the moral character of the persons under consideration, it ought to be well substantiated. Yet the whole proof which is adduced amounts to this, that Mr. Whitfield, when he was a child, was fond of a clergyman's employment; that he was led, "even at that early period, to pray over the 118th psalm;" and that, "when he was a common drawer at an inn, he composed two or three sermons."

Here our readers will perceive that want of conclusiveness and discrimination of which we complain. Is there any impropriety, we would ask, in supposing that the mind may, at an early period, be susceptible of religious impressions, and even of desires after usefulness in the Church, which may be afterwards recollected with gratitude, when God has in his providence accomplished those desires? May we not be permitted "to pray over the 118th psalm," or to recollect very early movings of the blessed spirit upon our hearts, (p. 205,) without exposing ourselves to the imputation of spiritual pride and ambition?

We would not be understood to affirm that, in the instances before us, the conclusions drawn by Mr. Whitfield were justly formed; or that, on many occasions, the workings of pride and ambition might not have been mistaken for a divine influence: we maintain only that there is nothing unscriptural, or inconsistent with the analogy of the divine proceedings, in supposing that certain desires and impressions may be felt in youth, which, though not fully understood at the time, may be afterwards reasonably ascribed to the influences of the Holy Ghost, gradually expanding the heart, and qualifying for future usefulness. How often has the future eminence of the poet, the philosopher, and the mechanic, been anticipated from the prognostics of early childhood! The infant propensities have gradually displayed themselves: we have been delighted with the exertions of nascent genius, and have marked with astonishment the little specimens of ingenuity in a child, who has seemed to have no other guide or instructor than the spontaneous energies of his own talents! Why then should it be thought incredible that a Mini-

ster of Christ should, in early life, display something of *his* peculiar talent, or that, by the directing Providence of God, secretly operating, he should make an early choice of that honourable station?

Another instance of our author's want of discrimination may be found in his discussion of the subject of *miracles*, p. 226—230. The *necessity* of working miracles was disclaimed by Mr. Wesley, (p. 226,) and the *power* of working them unequivocally disallowed. "We are now to require," says Mr. Nott, "that they act consistently with these declarations." In order to prove that this was not the case, Mr. Nott has extracted from their journals and other writings a variety of passages which, though they tend to corroborate the charge of Enthusiasm, and furnish just cause of censure on other accounts, yet do not bear on the point immediately in hand, we mean the alleged claim to miraculous gifts. As for the absurd and ridiculous stories of possessions, trances, apparitions, &c. with which the journals and magazines of Mr. Wesley are disgraced, and some of which are cited by Mr. Nott as proving the claim in question; they prove, it is true, the strange credulity of the narrator, but we cannot discover that they were ever brought forward as *miraculous attestations* in favour of his divine mission. With respect to the passages wherein a divine interference is recorded, and acknowledged with thankfulness, we by no means think that they will bear the construction which is put upon them by our author. Many of the instances, indeed, are too trifling for public perusal, and, from the manner in which they are detailed, are calculated to bring ridicule on the scriptural doctrine of a particular providence; while the language in which they are conveyed is often not only too strong for the occasion, but sometimes even highly indecorous. Still, as far as we can judge from an attentive and candid consideration of what these passages contain, Messrs. Whitfield and Wesley appear to us to have merely intended to express their thankfulness for what they regarded as *providential interpositions*, and not to assert any *miraculous* operations in their favour. What others would regard as accidental occurrences, they noticed as the workings of that Providence which watched over them in common with all other Christians, and which we are told is so minute in its attention, that the very hairs of our head are all "numbered," and "a sparrow doth not fall to the ground without our heavenly Father." The devout Christian loves to acknowledge God in all his ways, to admire his goodness in the daily and hourly occurrences of life, and to mark with humble thankfulness the love of his heavenly Father, in what may be called little things, as well as in the more prominent events of his history. He has learnt to ascribe all his comforts and all his deliverances to the superintending care of him "who neither slumbereth nor sleepeth." In the refreshing rest of the night, and comforts of the day; in the calm of domestic intercourse, and the bustle of active life; in the prosperous enjoyment of earthly blessings, and in the support experienced under the loss of them; in preservation from apprehended dangers, and in freedom from the fear of evil, the believer traces the hand of his God. He does not regard these things as the operose exertions of an Epicurean Deity, but as the workings of him whose tender mercies are over all his works, and who with the same ease administers to the necessities of millions, as though his attention were limited to a single individual: nor does he speak of them as miraculous interruptions of the course of nature, but as the common operations of that bountiful benefactor, in "whom we live, move, and have our being."

"Every page almost of their Journals abounds with the accounts of their miraculous preservation amidst imminent dangers. I cannot forbear noticing however the following instance. Mr. Whitefield in his First Journal, p. 23, having described a wonderful deliverance which God had wrought for him when at sea, adds, 'God so ordered it, that I knew nothing of it till it was over.' As if the Almighty was careful not only to preserve his life, but even to save him from needless anxiety and apprehension." (p. 230.)

For our parts we can discover no claim to *miraculous* interference in the above cited passage. Mr. Whitfield piously acknowledges the goodness of God in preserving him from the knowledge of his danger. And is it no blessing to be saved from needless anxiety and apprehension? If it be, to whom ought we to look as the author of the blessing but God?

Does it not become us to thank him then, if he deliver us from fear and terror? Does not experience prove that the prospect of approaching danger, and the anticipation of expected trials, produce often more uneasiness than the events themselves? And is it any laborious exertion of Almighty power thus to deliver his servants from trouble? Other instances of exaggerated censure might be produced; but those are sufficient to prove that Mr. Nott, in his honest zeal against the extravagancies of Enthusiasm, has been carried too far: he has incautiously censured expressions which reason and scripture authorize; and has done real harm to that cause which he appears so anxious to advance, the cause, we mean, of vital, practical Religion.

We request our readers to bear in mind that we set out with expressing it as our opinion, that the charges of Enthusiasm and Vanity were, in part, substantiated against the founders of Methodism. We plead only against the extent to which the charges are carried, and the indiscriminate censure with which they are supported; and this we have done, partly in justice to the accused, and partly from our regard to vital religion, which invariably suffers, whenever, in the attempt to expose error, sufficient care is not taken to ascertain the nature and defend the interests of truth. Every Christian Observer must be sensible how much a profane world ridicules experimental Religion. The proud formalist can neither understand nor tolerate the self-abasing confessions of the humble penitent; nor can the man, whose affections are rivetted to the earth, endure the zeal, the heavenly mindedness, the love, the fervour of the devout Christian. When, therefore, in our endeavours to guard against a *voluntary* humility, we appear to depreciate that which is genuine; when, from a dread of ill-regulated zeal, we expose to contempt that fervour which is the nerve and sinew of the christian warfare; when, in guarding the precincts of sober Religion, we disparage that affectionate warmth, the value of which can never be duly estimated by the cold calculating philosophist, or the mere formalist; we tremble lest occasion of triumph should be afforded to the enemies of the Gospel, and the hands of sincere Christians should thereby be enfeebled. Let it not be supposed that we mean to deny, that Messrs. Whitfield and Wesley betrayed, on many occasions, a spirit which reflects discredit on their professed character and office. In the commencement of their career they sometimes censured others, and even denounced judgments against them, with a most indecorous intolerance; while, of themselves and their own labours, they spoke with a complacency that savoured of pride. Borne along with the tide of popularity, they recorded their success with unbecoming exultation, and decided on the providential dispensations of God with an assurance ill-according with the short-sightedness of fallible man. Towards the close of his life Mr. Whitfield acknowledged these things with sorrow: and his frankness, in this respect, merits our particular attention.

"I will freely and readily acknowledge," he observes in a letter to the author of an anonymous pamphlet, "that you and others have had too much occasion for reflection by several things that have been *unwarily dropped* up and down in my journals."—"My journals were some of my most *early performances*, wrote too in the very heights of my first popularity (which is apt to make the strongest head run giddy), in the midst of which persons very often do things, which after-experience and riper judgment teach them to correct and amend."—"There is generally much, too much severity in our first zeal, at least there was in mine."—"His and my treatment of Archbishop Tillotson was by far too severe. We condemned his state, when we ought only in a candid manner (which I would do again if called to it) to have mentioned what we judged wrong in his doctrines. I do not justify it. I condemn myself most heartily, and ask pardon for it." (*Whitfield's Tracts*, 234, 235, 242.)

In reply to one who had expostulated with him on certain expressions in his journals, he writes thus:

"Alas! alas! in how many things have I judged, and acted wrong! I have been too rash and hasty in giving characters both of places and persons. Being fond of scripture language, I have often used a style too apostolical, and at the same time I have been too bitter in my zeal, wildfire has been mixed with it; and I find that I have frequently written and spoken too much in my own spirit, when I thought I was writing and speaking entirely by the assistance of the Spirit of God. I have likewise too much made impressions, without the written word, my rule of

acting; and too soon, and too explicitly, published what had better been kept in longer, or left to have been told after my death." (*Whitfield's Tracts*, p. 243.)

"My mistakes have been too many, and my blunders too frequent, to make me set up for infallibility. I came soon into the world; I have carried high sail, whilst running through a whole torrent of popularity and contempt; and, by this means, have sometimes been in danger of oversetting. But many and frequent as my mistakes have been, or may be, as I have no part to act, if I know any thing of my heart, but to promote GOD's glory, and the good of souls, as soon as I have been made sensible of them, they shall be publicly acknowledged and retracted." (*Whitfield's Tracts*, p. 245.)

"I thank you, Sir, for pointing out to me a very wrong expression in the last part of my life. My words are these; 'I could no longer walk on foot as usual; but was constrained to go in a coach, to avoid the *Hosanna's* of the multitude.' Your remark runs thus, sect. 8. page 20. '*Very profane*, unless it be a false print for *huzza's*.' I could wish it had been so; but the word was my own; and though not intended to convey a *profane idea*, was very wrong and unguarded, and I desire may be buried in oblivion, unless you, or some other kind person, are pleased to remind me of it, in order to lay me low before God and man." (*Whitfield's Tracts*, p. 244.)

It here deserves to be noticed, that several of the particulars, which in the above extracts are so candidly admitted, and so feelingly deplored, have been treated with peculiar severity by Mr. Nott in the volume before us. See pp. 207, and 280, in the latter of which passages the adoption of the word *Hosannah* is marked with very prominent censure, extending through the following page. That these things merited severe censure is, undoubtedly, true; but surely, after the humble acknowledgments above cited, it became a candid writer either to mention the retractation, or to suppress the facts altogether. Mr. Nott has indeed extracted a passage from Whitfield's works, expressive of a like painful recollection on another occasion; but he does not appear to us to have made a candid use of that passage. The inference he draws from it is merely this: that, therefore, Mr. Whitfield possesses no title to apostolical authority! (See p. 252*.) A candid adversary might surely have allowed it to furnish a strong indication of the humility and sincerity of Mr. Whitfield's character.

The sixth and seventh sermons treat of the injury resulting to Christianity from enthusiastical delusions. The effects which they produce on ecclesiastical and civil establishments, on the former by corrupting the purity of the faith, and on the latter by weakening the bond of civil union, are successively considered, and form the respective subjects of a discourse. Some good observations occur in the first of these sermons, in which the author shews in what manner Enthusiasm corrupts our faith. Five sources of mischief are specified. Enthusiasm is considered as injurious to society, from its adoption of feeling as the rule of action; from its leading to a contempt of human instruction; to a neglect of the Word of God; a misunderstanding of its doctrines; and a misrepresentation of its commands.

Having briefly touched on these points, the author finally dismisses the subject of Enthusiasm, and then unaccountably passes to the consideration of Schism, to which he afterwards confines his attention; but without attempting farther to prove the connexion or relation of these evils with each other. His remarks on the tendency of Schism to corrupt the faith, if they had been more naturally connected with the subject, would have produced a better effect. He observes that Schism operates to the injury of Christianity, by giving perpetuity to heresies; introducing unsettled notions of Religion; encouraging scepticism; affording to impostors a facility of propagating false Religions; and producing a general carelessness and laxity of opinion in all things belonging to the faith of Christ. On the last of these heads we meet with the following just remark.

"It may be reasonably doubted, however, whether an universal laxity in points of religious faith; whether a total disregard to the sacredness of divine institutions; and an indifference to the public profession and dissemination of error, might not ultimately become instruments for the propagation of false Religion, full as deadly and as powerful even as the sword of Mahomet." (p. 369, 370.)

* We fully admit this inference, but as it might have been still more satisfactorily established by other extracts, wherein Mr. Whitfield himself directly disclaims all title to apostolical authority, we could wish to have seen a more liberal use made of that to which we have adverted.

In pursuing the subject the author was led to consider the nature of *liberality of sentiment.* On this term so much used, but so little understood, this watch-word of dissension and infidelity, we were pleased to read the following discriminating observations.

"If a principle thus liable to abuse must still be encouraged, it becomes us accurately to define, what are the limits to which it may extend, and what are the objects to which it can apply. For instance. We are to insist, that it ought to affect only the temper of mind in which each individual undertakes the examination of religious truths, and not the truths themselves; that it may lead him to be charitable in his judgment concerning the motives of another's conduct; but that it cannot alter the real quality of that conduct: and that it may lead him to encourage a spirit of Christian charity towards all who are not as strong in faith as himself; but that it will not allow him to be indifferent either to the increase of error, or to the defence of truth. For when the evidences in favour of the Christian doctrines are once fully established and admitted, then it is the mark of a noble, a great, and a liberal spirit to be firm and unwavering in the profession of them. But why are we ever to forget, what is of the utmost importance in the present question, that he alone who made a law, has the power of dispensing with obedience to that law?" (p. 379, 380.)

The eighth and last sermon treats of *Liberty of Conscience.* Some useful remarks occur in this part of the volume. In opposing the misconceptions of the Enthusiast the author observes, that "Conscience has by no means respect to ourselves alone: it is rather a principle by which we are taken from our ownselves, and are made to consider human conduct as connected with various important and external obligations." (p. 447.) Without stopping to discuss the exact propriety of the language here used, the meaning of the passage is evident, and it would be happy for the Christian Church if a more practical regard were paid to the truth which it inculcates. Too many professing Christians, "arguing that their conscience is to be a law unto themselves, view it in this light so exclusively, that they appear never to have enquired whether it may not be a law which has reference to others also. So that, instead of connecting it with social duties; instead of making it a principle of Christian regard to the happiness of their neighbour; they render it a consideration altogether personal and selfish." (p. 448.) Having exposed the fallacy of this reasoning, the author briefly points out the principles on which the decisions of conscience are founded. (p. 456—459.)

With respect to liberty of conscience, the reader who expects to find a satisfactory discussion of this important subject will be greatly disappointed. The author does not profess to examine the nice and difficult points which are involved in the inquiry. Liberty of conscience can only be considered in two senses, (p. 460); "either it means the right of freely inquiring into the nature of religious truth, in order to obtain those just opinions which are necessary towards the right formation of the conscience; or, secondly, it must imply the liberty of acting without restraint according to those persuasions which the conscience shall approve." Understanding it in the former sense, it certainly is not "possible that any human restraint should be imposed." With respect to the liberty of acting without restraint, according to the dictates of conscience, a variety of considerations are to be taken into the account, and much nice investigation is necessary to clear the subject of all its difficulties. It is evident that liberty of conscience, in this sense of the expression, ought, in many cases, to be restrained. Whenever the peace of society is endangered, individual freedom must be sacrificed to the public good; else every turbulent innovator might urge pleas of conscience as an excuse for kindling the flames of civil animosity. But it is the wisdom of a state rather to remit a portion of its just authority, than to impose arbitrary and galling restraints on the public mind. We cannot be sufficiently thankful for the lenience of our own laws in this respect; and our readers will, with us, cordially assent to the author's view of the effects which that moderation should produce on the different members of society.

"If Civil Society so respect the peace of their Conscience, as that, even when circumstances might seem to justify some restraint, none is imposed; it then becomes a reciprocal duty on their part, to respect the peace of society. For the community at large has a just and a sacred

claim upon every one of us, that we never exercise our liberty of Conscience either wilfully or capriciously, to the detriment of the public good." (p. 483.)

By this time the reader will have formed a tolerably clear idea of the merits of this volume. Its radical defect we conceive to be, a misapprehension of the grand subject of discussion. On the genealogy of Enthusiasm, in the first discourse, we have already animadverted; and we have only to add that the author adheres to his original statement, throughout the whole book. In the eighth discourse, as in the first, his Enthusiast is proud and ambitious; he still innovates, still "persuades himself of the reality of a divine commission by the *wilful effort* of a perverted imagination," and "teaches his delusion to others in a manner subversive of all established order." All this, as we observed, is solely applicable to the enthusiastical leaders of a party; for such therefore, and for those who are prone to encourage them, is his work principally calculated. The author has also unnecessarily limited his subject by attaching so much *wilful* criminality to the enthusiastical character; and has thus lost an important opportunity of making much discriminating remark, which might have tended to counteract the prevailing errors of the religious world. If the Enthusiast be clothed with the garb of pride, insubordination, deliberate blindness, wilful delusion, and restless ambition, he becomes indeed a most hideous and disgusting object. But we would hope that few such characters are to be found amongst us; and sure we are that still fewer will apply an overcharged statement of this nature to themselves, so as to receive due benefit from the wholesome admonitions of the preacher. Enthusiasm is indeed a destructive evil, and its ravages in the Church have been incalculable; but in opposing its further progress, we should proceed with caution, we should act with tenderness. Let the nature and origin of the malady be distinctly and fairly opened, and the remedies be applied with a skilful regard to its real symptoms. We should not, perhaps, err, if we were to assert, that the case of the Enthusiast (we speak of the great majority of those who deserve the name) is a case of debility; a weakness rather than a crime; an error of the head much more than of the heart. We need here the correcting lenitives of the physician, rather than the caustic or amputating knife of the surgeon. Let us direct the Enthusiast to the true remedy, by inculcating an humble regard to the sacred oracles. "If any man will do the will of God, he shall know the doctrines, whether they be of God." A diligent perusal of the Scriptures, and an habitual reference to them as the standard of all our opinions, combined with earnest prayer for the divine teaching, are the best antidotes of enthusiastical delusions. We should learn how to pursue virtue (as it has been well observed) from the blind man who first examines the ground with his staff. Unspeakable benefits would result from such a cautious investigation, and the Scriptures would in that case be found "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness;" and we should be "thoroughly furnished by them for every good work."

In addition to the free remarks we have already made on this work, we must add that the author has himself occasionally manifested a degree of that indiscreet zeal, which, when applied in another direction, it is his professed object to counteract. Thus, in the first sermon, he tells us, (p. 2.), that perhaps none of the apostolic injunctions can be selected which is "*so* evidently of perpetual obligation as the text," which is "Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits." Of perpetual obligation it unquestionably is; but are not the injunctions concerning repentance towards God, and faith in Christ, equally or more so? Again, p. 145, he observes that "the love of God is *never so clearly manifested*, as when it would exclude all wilful innovations from divine worship." Sentiments of this kind, of which many other instances occur, betray a zeal which is "not according to knowledge." The regulation of the heart and affections is surely of *greater* consequence than a regard to merely external forms. One crying evil of the day is, we verily believe, a disregard to forms, and a contempt of established order; but let us not, in our zeal for upholding these, overlook, or make light of, the weightier matters of the law, "judgment, mercy, and faith."

The Use of Sacred History; especially as illustrating and confirming the Great Doctrines of Revelation. To which are prefixed, Two Dissertations; the first, on the Authenticity of the History contained in the Pentateuch, and in the Book of Joshua; the second, proving that the Books ascribed to Moses were actually written by him, and that he wrote them by divine Inspiration. In Two Volumes. By JOHN JAMIESON, D.D. F. A. S. S. Minister of the Gospel, Edinburgh. 8vo. Vol. I. pp. viii, and 464; Vol. II. pp. 462. Edinburgh; London, Matthews, Ogle, and Hatchard. 1802.

In the present profusion of theological works there is reason to fear, lest the generality of Christians should suffer themselves to be diverted from the study of the Scriptures; for although these be universally considered and reverenced by all writers, who deserve the name of Christian, as the sole fountain of revealed truth, yet, valuable and beneficial as their labours are, they cannot fail to deliver the doctrines and duties of Christianity under their own particular view, and with their own interpretation, of them. Such works, therefore, far from superseding the study of the Bible, should not even be put upon a level with it; but should be content to occupy a subordinate place, a place, however, of high honour, and act as a handmaid to the sacred volume, confirming its truth, elucidating its contents, and inculcating its supreme authority and importance. The field of theological science is so extensive, that some productions approach much nearer to this character than others, and have a direct tendency to lead the reader to search for divine truth in its source and original repository. The work which we are about to review well deserves to be placed in this class. The reader will find himself almost continually within the region of Scripture, and he will be taught to consider that portion of it which is generally esteemed least susceptible of instruction, as conveying the most important lessons, and the most important truths, in a manner the most forcible and impressive.

Mr. Jamieson has undertaken to shew the use of the historical part of Scripture, particularly as illustrating and confirming the great Doctrines of Revelation. The specific object is not entered upon till the author comes to his second volume, the first being taken up with preliminary topics; and not an inconsiderable number of pages is devoted to the Two important Dissertations which are prefixed to the work.

The first is upon the Authenticity of the History contained in the Pentateuch, and in the Book of Joshua. Our author has, upon this subject, collected evidence which will abundantly satisfy every impartial inquirer. He has shewn, that the Israelites would never have received the Books of Moses as divine, unless they had been persuaded of their truth; and that they never could have been persuaded of their truth, had they not been actually and indisputably true. Among the memorials of the facts related in this part of Scripture we are surprised to find the universal and very important one of circumcision omitted; especially since it has been insisted upon with so much justice and effect by Leslie, in his well known performance against the Deists. There is a good collection of passages from heathen authors, recognizing and attesting the general truth of the Mosaic History. Those of Justin and Tacitus are very remarkable. The partiality and levity of the latter historian, when the histories of Josephus, a native and very credible writer, were accessible and well known at Rome, would bear some animadversion. We think, however, that Mr. Jamieson has not, upon this subject, made so copious a reference to the Asiatic Researches as the importance, novelty, and decision of the evidence derived from that quarter might seem to require. The abundant evidence furnished by all antiquity, and particularly by Asiatic antiquity, to that most wonderful and important event, the deluge, was worthy of peculiar attention. The learned and homogeneous works of Bryant and Faber contain a fund of interesting information upon this extraordinary subject.

The second Dissertation proposes to prove, that the Books ascribed to Moses were actually written by him, and that he wrote them by divine inspiration. The lines of evidence which conspire to prove this point, particularly that the Pentateuch is to be ascribed to Moses as its author,

are so strong and decisive, that the faint and doubtful appearance of the few, which interfere or clash with them, seem hardly to deserve any notice from a real lover of truth. There have been writers, however, who, from different motives, have endeavoured to invalidate the fact. Aben-Ezra, a modern Jew, is the first who ventured to call in question what all *his* forefathers and *ours* have admitted without any scruple. Hobbes, Spinoza, Simon, Le Clerc, followed. Witsius has considered this important question at some length in the first volume of his Miscellanea Sacra. And from this elaborate dissertation Mr. Jamieson seems to have borrowed the greater part of his materials. He is certainly entitled to much commendation and thanks, for having put such a chain of correct argumentation on a very important subject into the possession of the English reader. The intrinsic evidence of the book itself is derived from various passages, which expressly ascribe the writing of considerable portions of the Pentateuch to Moses. The inference from those portions to the whole is almost inevitable. There is not the least appearance of different hands being employed in the penning of this book, and there is every appearance that it was penned by one. The uniform opinion of the Jews, till of late, ascribed the first five of their sacred books, or the Pentateuch, to their legislator. Both the Pharisees and the Sadducees agreed in this sentiment, and the Old Testament in many places recognizes the Pentateuch as the work of Moses. The objections to this fact are founded upon short and insulated expressions, either misunderstood or easily solved: and even were they allowed to be valid, their weight is so trifling, when placed in the balance against the opposing evidence, that they could affect no competent or impartial inquirer. To ascertain the real value and force of an argument, it is often of great use to suppose it to be on the opposite side; to suppose, for instance, agreeably to the present case, that the arguments against the authorship of Moses, were those which were intended to establish his authorship. We have no doubt, that the persons who now espouse them, and consider them of importance, would, in that case, regard them with perfect contempt. For then, in addition to their own weakness, they would labour under the disadvantage of being in favour of a generally received opinion: a circumstance, which, in the judgment of some persons, is sufficient, of itself, and in an instant, to convert truth into falsehood. Stillingfleet's Orig. Sac. Book II. ch. i—iii. may be consulted on the subject of both these Dissertations.

We now proceed to the body of the work. The first part is entitled, "A general View of the Use of Sacred History." In the first section of this part is contained a general account of the various subjects of sacred history; the origin of all things; the original state of man; the origin of evil; the reason of the change visible on the face of nature, &c. &c. That which relates to the human heart deserves to be presented to the reader.

"Here we have the history of the human *heart*. Of all history, that of man is most interesting to man: and of all the history of man, the most important branch is that of the heart. In tracing its various workings, what is called the philosophy of history especially consists. To exhibit these in the most striking light, as if the field of real history were too narrow, many enter into the fairy land of fiction. But in the sacred volume, we find a variety unknown to any real or fictitious history. When we view it as unfolding the operations of the heart, may we not justly say, that it contains the substance of all that has ever been written on the subject, with unspeakable advantage?

"Without a display of the heart, the history of man would be exceedingly imperfect. It would be otherwise only a barren narrative of facts. But, in the Holy Scriptures, the heart is exhibited in all its exceedingly varied operations, traced in all its windings, and stript of all its disguises. It is represented in its different states: in its original purity, as formed after the image of God; as it is depraved by sin; and as partially renewed by grace. We learn its operations, as under the power of that evil spirit, who 'now worketh in the children of disobedience;' or of that blessed Spirit who worketh effectually in them who believe. We perceive it in various situations; in solitude and in society; as working in the prince, and in the beggar. In a word, we find it traced through a long succession of ages, and discern its actings in a vast variety of individuals.

"Many are best pleased with those writings, which are most calculated to touch the more delicate strings of the heart. Some even go so far as to bring all

human action to the test of sentiment. With these philosophers, feeling is the supreme standard. But where are the nicer sensibilities of the soul more beautifully delineated than in the page of inspiration? Let any impartial person say, if he ever saw the tenderness of brotherly affection more finely painted than in the history of Joseph.

"That branch of the history of the heart, which conveys the most humiliating lessons, is very largely handled. I mean, that of its depravity. To unfold this is evidently one of the principal designs of Sacred History. A great part of it is clearly a commentary on that affecting text; 'God saw that the wickedness of man was great on the earth; and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.' This humbling character of man is given, not merely before the deluge, but also immediately after it. As the history of the old world is concluded, the history of the new is introduced, with this reflection."

The author then proceeds to point out the progress of corruption, as Scripture describes it, in the heart of each individual. See pp. 175—179.

The second section of the first part of this work treats of the Beauties of Sacred History; its simplicity, conciseness, fidelity, dignity, unity, &c. &c. The illustrations of these different qualities are well executed, and cannot fail to impress the mind of the unprejudiced reader very forcibly.

The third section discusses and exemplifies the advantages arising from the historical mode of writing. The author has, to our conviction, proved it to be the best mode of rendering divine truths level to the understanding, of exciting attention, of influencing the affections, and of impressing the mind in various ways—objects, all of them, of the last, of indispensable, importance. It is an additional recommendation of the historical mode, that it exhibits truth as attested by experience, and that it gives a successive evidence of the truth of Revelation.

The second part of Mr. Jamieson's work is "On the History of Israel." —"It was the will of the all-wise God," says this author at the entrance upon this subject, "to give a national existence to this people, to cast them into such a mould, and to regulate every thing concerning them in such a manner, that they might prefigure that true Israel which he hath gathered out of 'every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation'." In treating this arduous and delicate argument we do not think that our author has been so successful, as he might have been, had he known how to restrain the sallies of a vivid imagination. Mr. Jamieson, in common with other writers, who are attached to the typical illustration of Scripture, always, to appearance, supposes a type, wherever a resemblance exists between the Jewish and Christian dispensations. This appears to us equivocal. For nothing could be more natural, than that the writers of the New Testament should draw their images from ideas which were familiar both to themselves and their readers. Wherever any analogy existed this would naturally be done, whether the originals of their illustrations were intended to be be typical or not. It is curious to observe the different directions of the ratiocinative faculty in different persons. Dr. Taylor, of Norwich, has attempted to reduce all the expressions of the New Testament to the sense of those to which they are analogous in the Old; while many typical writers absolutely christianize almost every article of the Old Testament, and interpret every expression by the sense which it bears in the perfecting dispensation of Christianity. By these observations we do not, in the smallest degree, intend to invalidate the sober and legitimate consideration of the typical, which is, doubtless, a very important part of the Old Testament. We wish only to discountenance and restrain its extravagances. We cannot help thinking that the general history, and some prominent particulars of the history of the Israelites, was intended to prefigure the Christian Church. Who can refuse his assent to the typical intention of that remarkable transaction, the intended sacrifice of Isaac, or of the whole system of the Jewish sacrifices in general? If the resemblance discovered between the two dispensations be nothing more than the result of an ardent and fertile imagination, let the experiment be tried upon the antient histories of Egypt, or Greece, or Rome; and let it be shewn what representations are contained in them of the Christian dispensation. If the analogy is only invented in the one case, it ought to bear the being invented in the others with equal plausibility. It deserves likewise to be observed, that the peculiar con-

struction of the Jewish economy and their Scriptures, and the aptness of both to furnish those terms and ideas, which were essential to the proper understanding of the Christian dispensation, indicate the adaptation of the one system to the other, and, even without the intervention of any typical supposition, fix the divine character of both, and prove them both to have proceeded from infinite knowledge and infinite power.

Our author has, in our opinion as well as that of the generality of Christians, justly illustrated the typical character of the oblation of the first fruits on the third day after the sacrifice of the pascal lamb, as prefiguring the resurrection of Christ. We subscribe likewise to what he has written on the Feast of Pentecost. Respecting his interpretation of the Feast of Tabernacles we hesitate.

The second volume opens with, and contains, the principal subject of Mr. Jamieson's work. This is the third part, and is entitled, "Of the Use of Sacred History, as illustrating and confirming the Great Doctrines of Revelation." This part is divided into seventeen sections, containing some one or other of the fundamental doctrines which the Sacred History illustrates and confirms.

The universality of the divine dominion in opposition to the heathen notion of topical deities is well illustrated, pp. 11—14. Many important observations occur respecting the iniquities of parents being visited upon their children, and the destruction of the Canaanites. In the discussion of this latter subject, the profane sophistry of Dr. Geddes is justly exposed. See pp. 183, & seq.

To what our author, however, reasons, in representing the sovereignty of God as displayed in permitting the entrance of sin, we feel a strong objection; and we think he has allowed himself in speculations, which do not belong to man, and can scarcely be indulged without presumption and danger. See pp. 204, & seq. We particularly reprobate the following passage:

"It therefore appears, that God absolutely decreed the permission of sin, in order to illustrate the glory of his own sovereignty and independence, as contrasted with the mere dependence of his most exalted creatures,' &c. p. 211. See likewise, p. 215.

What a world of blind and pernicious controversy might be raised upon this inscrutable subject!

But we leave with pleasure this topic, to direct the attention of our readers to the ninth section, where they will find an able proof of the existence of a particular providence.

Section xiii. on Substitution and Atonement, compresses the greater part of scriptural information upon that very important subject. It is here that the typical character of the Mosaic institutions is least questionable.

In the fifteenth section, on the Necessity of Almighty Power for changing the Heart, our author endeavours to illustrate and prove this important doctrine by the personal ministry of our Lord. The passage is striking.

"In proof of the indispensable necessity of divine power for the salvation of sinners, may I not appeal to the *personal ministry* of our Lord? The great salvation 'began to be spoke' by him. He 'spake as never man spake.' Nothing but truth proceeded from his lips. He 'spake the words of God.' What he had 'seen and heard that he testified.' His enemies were often silenced, and at times captivated, by his discourses. He confirmed his doctrines by the most astonishing miracles, such as they could neither disprove nor deny. Yet 'no man received his testimony.' He had reason to complain that he had 'laboured in vain,' and that Israel was 'not gathered.'—'His own received him not.' He wept over Jerusalem, saying, 'How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not.'

"What was the design of this, but to teach us, that human reason, even in its highest possible perfection, is unavailing? It was the will of God, that the personal ministry of Christ himself should be attended with comparatively little efficacy; to illustrate the necessity of divine power, and to put honour on the ministration of the Spirit."—"The effusion of the Holy Ghost was withheld, till the personal ministry of Christ was at an end. But when the disciples received 'power from on high,' a single sermon, preached by one of them, was attended with far greater success than the whole of Christ's ministry." (pp. 399, 400.)

In section sixteen, Mr. Jamieson not only appears as a patron of the doctrine of particular redemption, but he selects it as one of the great doctrines of revelation, which Sacred History illustrates and confirms. He

asks, on the subject of the promise to our first parents,

"Does God put enmity between them," (the members of Christ's mystical body), "and the seed of the serpent; and hath Christ the same love to them that he hath to his own seed? Does not the promise respect him as well as his members? How then can he be an adversary to the seed of the serpent, and yet die for their salvation? In consequence of this enmity, does Christ bruise the *head* of the serpent; and from the same principle, does he purchase redemption for all his *seed?* The very contrary, surely." (pp. 402, 403.)

We quote this passage, not for the argument, which to us is, in no degree, convincing, but for the sentiment, which opposes all our notions of the express doctrines and general tenor of Scripture. Even professed Calvinists have disclaimed the doctrine of particular redemption: even President Edwards allows, that, *in some sense,* Christ may be said to have died for all. That the ultimate effect of the redemption of Jesus Christ will be limited or particular, the evidence is too decisive as well as melancholy to admit a doubt. But this determines nothing with respect to the actual extent of the value of Christ's atonement, or to the intention of God in appointing it. We feel ourselves upon the point of embarking upon a wide, an illimitable, an unfathomable ocean: we know the rocks and the storms which are to be expected in traversing it; and we think it not only safest but wisest not to adventure upon the voyage. We were not a little surprised to find a man of Dr. Jamieson's piety and good sense, using "Arminians" as a term of reproach, and linking them with Deists, p. 409.

On the whole, we consider the present publication as a work of great utility, and as discovering considerable ability and exertion. Too much honour is done to the atheistical incendiary Paine by the frequent reference to his writings, which will soon evaporate into nonentity or oblivion. We do think likewise, that if the author had bestowed more pains in establishing the principles which he has assumed and reasoned upon, his work would have acquired additional value. The system of Spencer on the subject of the Mosaic Ritual, which is very dissonant from that which Mr. Jamieson adopts, should have been noticed, and at least generally refuted. These, however, and what we have animadverted upon besides, are but slender deductions from the mass of excellent matter which these volumes contain, and they deserve to be recommended to every one who would read the Scriptures, particularly the historical part of them, with understanding and improvement. The strain of warm and affectionate piety which runs through the whole must be extremely gratifying, as well as profitable, to those who study religious truth for its proper and best end; and they will rejoice to find some parts of Scripture replete with important information, which they had perhaps been accustomed to consider as least adapted to convey it.

REVIEW OF REVIEWS, *&c. &c.*

ON "THE CRITICAL REVIEW" OF THE CHRISTIAN OBSERVER'S EXAMINATION OF MR. DAUBENY'S "VINDICIÆ ECCLESIÆ ANGLICANÆ."

(Continued from p. 569.)

In our Review of Mr. Daubeny's "*Vindiciæ,*" we made the following remarks:

"Some of the errors of Mr. Daubeny are of a nature, which scarcely admits of their being regarded as proceeding merely from a want of acquaintance with the subject, or as the mere effect of prejudice or irritation. For these sources of error some allowance may fairly be claimed; and in the present instance we feel fully disposed to admit the claim. But when Mr. Daubeny represents Bishop Cleaver as maintaing the *Non-calvinism* of Nowell's Catechism; although that prelate has directly admitted it to be Calvinistic:—when by the reiterated omission of an emphatic *not* in an extract from the homilies, he attributes to our Reformers sentiments directly the reverse of what they entertained:—when he refers to Strype as his authority for asserting that Bradford's Treatise on Election, did not obtain the sanction of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer; although Strype affirms, that it did obtain their approbation:—when he quotes the same author to prove that our Reformers did not

employ Calvin as their counsel, although that annalist distinctly states that Cranmer did apply to Calvin for counsel:—when he adduces the preface to Archbishop Parker's Bible, as furnishing decisive evidence of the designed exclusion of Calvinism from the Church; although the notes to that Bible, as well as the Catechism which is inserted in it, are in the highest degree Calvinistic;—and when, in opposition to all existing testimony, he contends that King James, and the English delegates to the Synod of Dort, preferred the sentiments of Arminius to those of Calvin:—we must profess ourselves unable to frame any probable hypothesis, which, without derogating from Mr. Daubeny's character for ingenuousness, will account for such errors. We can scarcely suppose them to be merely the result of inadvertence, or of ordinary prejudice, but either of some cause which remains to be explained, or of prejudice the most extraordinary." (*Christian Observer* for 1804, p. 683, and *Candid Examiner*, p. 132.)

On this passage the Critical Reviewer thus comments:

"Upon summing up this account, we see that there are six principal matters contained in it, and they are all important errors. We do not mean that they are all errors belonging to the Candid Examiner: nor yet, notwithstanding the confident assertions of that writer, are they all errors of Mr. Daubeny. The two gentlemen, we believe, divide the blame pretty equally between them. But what we wish to observe is, that the public is the sufferer; that the six errors, whencesoever they may have come, have been let loose to roam abroad, and to do their work of evil. It is our earnest desire, that if such facts will not make authors more circumspect, they may produce in readers a determination to have nothing to do with such controversialists, to leave them to fight it out by themselves; or at least may generate a salutary distrust and caution in the reception of their authorities and arguments." (*Crit. Rev.* p. 170.)

We might justly complain of the above comment as unfair and disingenuous. We shall suspend our complaints, however, until we have laid the grounds of them before our readers. The Reviewer affirms, that the blame of the six errors, which we have enumerated, is *divided pretty equally* between us and Mr. Daubeny. The first and second errors, he gently remarks, "we believe are Mr. Daubeny's."—"It is also true," he adds, "that Cranmer did, and that Strype tells us that Cranmer did, apply to Calvin for counsel: in this particular, therefore, we have nothing to say for Mr. Daubeny." Thus does he assign to Mr. Daubeny *his* portion of blame.

Let us now see in what way he relieves Mr. Daubeny from any participation in the other three errors, and proves them to be the exclusive property of the Christian Observer.

1. What we have said respecting Bradford's Treatise on Election, the Reviewer affirms to be an error; and this opinion he advances with many derogatory expressions, which it would serve no purpose to copy. The state of the case is as follows: Mr. Daubeny had affirmed in his "Vindiciæ," that "the circumstance of this treatise *having been entirely suppressed* by Bradford, authorized the conclusion that it did not obtain the sanction of the venerable martyrs." (p. 412.) Now we would observe in the first place, that Mr. Daubeny asserts the *entire suppression* of this treatise without the shadow of a proof. He refers, indeed, to Strype, but Strype is silent with respect to any such circumstance. Even the Reviewer does not pretend to adduce any proof that Bradford *suppressed* his treatise: and yet, on this unauthenticated fact, Mr. Daubeny gravely founds his conclusion. Strype's words are these: "Upon this occasion Ridley wrote a treatise of *God's Election and Predestination*. And Bradford wrote another, and sent it to those three fathers, in Oxford, for their approbation; and theirs being obtained, the rest of the eminent ministers about London were ready to sign it also." Now from what part of this statement the fact is deducible that Bradford *suppressed* his treatise, we are not so ingenious as to discover. Should we even allow, as the Reviewer contends, that the words, "*theirs being obtained*," are not, as the grammatical construction of the sentence seems to us to require, affirmative, but conditional, yet they will afford no support to Mr. Daubeny's conclusion, unless he can shew from history that the condition was not complied with. Besides, our mistake, admitting it, for the argument's sake, to be a mistake, is obviously one which will not affect the question at issue, and which ought not to have prevented a fair and impartial critic from blaming Mr. Daubeny's error in supporting his reasonings, by groundless allegations, and references which have no existence. Notwithstanding, however, all that the Reviewer has

said on the subject, we are still of opinion, that Bradford's treatise was not suppressed; and that that to which we have referred as now extant, and in our possession, is the same which he wrote in prison. Our Reviewer himself admits that a treatise written by Bradford, on the subject of Predestination and Election, is now extant. He thinks, however, that it is a different treatise from that which was written in prison. But supposing that Bradford, previously to his imprisonment, had composed a Treatise on Predestination and Election, which, on the hypothesis of our Reviewer, must have been the case, it is surely very unlikely that, in prison, where he must have laboured under many disadvantages for writing, he should have thought it necessary to compose a second. The first, which is full and comprehensive, would have served his purpose.

2. With regard to Archbishop Parker's Bible, we readily acknowledge that we have been led into an error, and have so far been instrumental in misleading the public. We feel obliged to the Critical Reviewer for his correction in this instance, and as it is our wish to repair, as much as possible, the evil that we have done, we take this opportunity of stating that the Bible, which contains the Calvinistic Catechism, as well as the notes to which we have referred, (*Christ. Obs.* for 1804, p. 631, and *Cand. Ex.* p. 113, &c.) is not (as we were led to suppose) the *Bishop's* Bible, but the *Geneva* Bible. The circumstance which principally misled us was, that the Bible into which we looked was printed by the Queen's printer, "*cum privilegio regiæ majestatis*:" and it did not occur to our recollection at the time, that the *Geneva* Bible, as well as the *Bishop's* Bible, had been honoured with *the royal imprimatur*. Let it not, however, be supposed that this mistake, which we are forward to confess and repair, in any way affects the point in dispute. For whatever be the opinions inculcated in the Geneva Bible, there is satisfactory proof that they so far met with the approbation both of Archbishop Parker, and of Grindall, Bishop of London, that these prelates recommended it to the Secretary of State to renew, for a term of years, the licence for its publication. (See *Strype's Parker*, p. 207.) And even if there were no proof of this fact, the reader who peruses the paper, entitled, "Sketches of the Reformation," in the present number of our work, will, we apprehend, see no reason to believe that Archbishop Parker's Bible proves, as Mr. Daubeny affirms that it does, the *hostility* of the Governors of our Church to the tenets of Calvinism.

3. Only one more point now remains to be considered. "The Synod of Dort, King James, and his Delegates," our Reviewer observes, "are so far removed from the sphere of the Reformation, that we really cannot bring ourselves to take any trouble about them: and not having Mr. Daubeny's work in our possession, we are less qualified to estimate correctly to what extent his alleged mis-statements, in this particular, may have proceeded." And yet, with *singular fairness*, the Reviewer puts down the whole of what is said on this subject as an error of our's, with a view, we suppose, to swell our share of blame to an equality with Mr. Daubeny's. Q. E. F.

Mr. Daubeny had affirmed, p. 422, "that King James, with the greatest part of the episcopal clergy, highly disapproved of the proceedings of the Synod of Dort, preferring the sentiments of Arminius to those of Gomarus and Calvin. In order to prove that Mr. Daubeny's view of the subject was directly opposed to the truth, we referred our readers to Hales's Golden Remains, p. 391; King James's Works, pp. 350. 354, 355. and 581; and Heylin's Life of Laud *. It is therefore somewhat extraordinary that our Reviewer, with Hales's Golden Remains before his eyes, (see *Crit. Rev.* p. 164.), should not have been able, in any degree, to appreciate the value of our remarks, even supposing him to have been so new to the subject, as not to have formed an opinion beforehand respecting so important a part of our ecclesiastical history. It is at least as extraordinary that he should attempt so copious a review of a pamphlet, entitling itself, an examination of Mr. Daubeny's work, and yet not have Mr. Daubeny's work in his possession. Considering the high tone

* We might have added Bishop Hall, who wrote a vindication of the proceedings of the Synod, at a late period of his life.

which he has assumed, it will be difficult to defend such an attempt from the charge of temerity, to speak in no harsher terms of it. We had produced a mass of evidence which went directly to disprove the affirmations of Mr. Daubeny; and which could not fail to leave on the mind of the Reviewer, had he thought proper to examine it, a conviction that Mr. Daubeny's work contained a palpable misrepresentation of facts, with respect to King James and the English Delegates at the Synod of Dort; and yet he not only contrives to produce an impression on the mind of his reader favourable to Mr. Daubeny's view of the subject; but he actually assigns this point, without examining, without pretending to examine it, to swell our portion of blame to its due dimensions. It is not a little curious that this instance of partial criticism should be followed by a formal declaration on the part of the Reviewer, that his object is "to plead with all his might the cause of moderation and christian charity, to detect misrepresentation, to rebuke intolerance, and ever to sound in the ears of the contending parties the words of the patriarchal expostulation, 'Sirs, ye are brethren: *why do ye* WRONG *one to another*'?"

Before we conclude, it may be right to guard, by a remark or two, against the possible misconception of the views by which we ourselves are actuated.

The attentive observer must have seen that, of late years, the peace of the Church has been disturbed, and the interests of christian charity deeply wounded, by the controversies which have arisen respecting the Calvinism or Arminianism of the Church of England. The partizans on either side have laboured to revive a spirit of bigotry and intolerance, and, in contempt of the clearest evidence, to persuade the world that all who think not with them, on the mysterious topics of predestination and election, are judged by the voice of the Church, as well as of its Reformers from Popery, to be guilty of heresy. Against such partial and untenable views of the subject, we have held ourselves bound to protest with all our might. It has uniformly been one of the objects of our work to point out the error of those writers, who, in their zeal for their own particular opinions, have endeavoured to narrow the Catholicism of the Church of England, by excluding from her pale any, whether they be Calvinists or Arminians,* WHO CORDIALLY BELIEVE AND OBEY THE GOSPEL OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR: *and in the prosecution of this object we have been equally forward to combat the erroneous statements of such writers as* PRESBYTER *on the one side, and of* DAUBENY *and* KIPLING *on the other. If our labours have given offence to these gentlemen, and to those who adopt with warmth their contracted and exclusive views, it is an effect which we regret, and which, if it could be done consistently with truth, we should be glad to obviate. We have the satisfaction however of believing, that our work has not been without its use in considerably enlarging the number of those who are disposed to adopt opinions more consonant to truth, and more consistent with the liberal spirit of the Church of England, and who, if they differ in their mode of explaining certain abstruse doctrines, are disposed to assert their respective sentiments temperately, and in a spirit of peace and conciliation.*

"Hic labor, hoc opus est."

Happy should we be, if the minds of men in general were turned from these barren and unprofitable discussions, to the cultivation of FAITH, HOPE, *and* CHARITY; *and if, instead of magnifying their differences on* UNESSENTIAL *points, they would endeavour to ascertain how many of those points they could exclude from their estimate of the Christian character, without, in any degree, weakening the foundation laid by the Apostles and Prophets, or impairing the beauty and perfection of that superstructure which every wise master builder will feel himself bound to erect upon it.*

* "The impious dogmas of Calvin," appear to have become the watchword of one party, and to be used by them in their visitation sermons, university sermons, &c. as a test of orthodoxy: while the language of some of the other party would seem to class Arminianism among the abominations of Popery, or at least to give it a place little removed from Pelagianism. Nothing but ignorance of the subject can excuse such flagrant offences against truth and charity, on which ever side they may be committed.

LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL INTELLIGENCE, &c. &c.

GREAT BRITAIN.

PREPARING for the press, *An Inquiry into the Nature of Civil and Military Subordination*; by JOHN MACDIARMID, Esq.—*Essays chiefly on Chymical Subjects*, by the late WILLIAM IRVINE, M. D. F. R. S. Ed. preparing by his son, Dr. IRVINE, of London, with some *Experimental Essays*, by himself.—*A Series of Dissertations, philosophical, physiological, and political, on Man*; by Dr. JARROLD, of Stockport: Disser. I. is on Population, in answer to Mr. Malthus.—A new Volume of SAURIN's *Sermons*, by Mr. SUTCLIFFE, of Halifax.—*Finis Pyramidis*, or the Recovery of the Standard of Linear Measure from the Pyramid of Giza, near Ancient Memphis, in Egypt; by the Reverend T. GABB.—An Abridgment of LIMBORCH's *Body of Divinity*; in 1 vol. 8vo.; by Mr. JOHN RILES.

In the press, a new *London Catalogue of Books*, from the Year 1800 to the present Time.—*A Natural History of Strawberries*, with the modern Improvements in their Cultivation; by Mr. R. WESTON.—*Travels in South America*, in a Series of Letters addressed to the late Mr. Yorke, of Taunton-Dean; by J. C. DAVIE, Esq.—A new Volume of the *Transactions of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Manchester*.—*The Domestic Guide in Cases of Insanity*; pointing out the Causes, with the Means of Preventing, and proper Treatment of that Disorder.—A Work on *Mineralogy*, being an Easy and Simple Method of arranging the Substances of the Mineral Kingdom into Classes, Orders, Genera, Species, and Varieties, according to their Distribution on the Surface of the Globe; by Dr. E. D. Clarke.—*A Dictionary of the Italian, French, and English Languages*, in 3 pocket vols. by M. POLIDORI.—*An Account of Stratford-on-Avon*; enriched by the Communications of Mr. SHARP, of Coventry.—A complete *Translation of the Systema Naturæ of* LINNÆUS, by Dr. TURTON.

A new edition of Dr. WOODVILLE's *Medical Botany* is in forwardness; and the publication, in Monthly Numbers, will commence in December. The work received the last corrections and improvements of the author. The articles are now regularly distributed according to the natural Order of Plants.

Dr. MAVOR has published a *correct* edition of the *Eton Latin Grammar*, in which his Explanatory Appendix, formerly printed separately, is now incorporated, together with Explanatory Notes collected from various Grammarians. The Notes tend to obviate an inconvenience which has been generally lamented, namely, that a boy who has made himself completely master of the Eton Grammar, when he comes to construing and parsing, will find himself ignorant of many particulars which it does not enable him to explain; and his teacher must either take upon himself to supply its deficiencies, or leave his pupil to pick up what he wants from more elaborate works, which are not perhaps within his reach, were he qualified to understand them. It were much to be wished, that some competent person would rescue the credit of the College, by giving perfectly correct Stereotype editions of all the Elementary Books used in the School.

The Leverian Museum of Natural History is to be disposed of in May next, by public auction, on the premises, unless an acceptable offer for the purchase of the whole should be previously made. It has been nearly forty years in collecting at an expence of almost £50,000.

Green succulent plants, such as cabbage, will keep much better after a momentary immersion in boiling water, as this destroys the vegetable life at once, and seems to prevent an after-process of decay or mortification, by which the plant would have been more considerably changed, if it had not been so suddenly killed.

In an ingenious paper lately sent by Dr. HERSCHEL to the Royal Society, that eminent astronomer announces a new discovery respecting Saturn. He has ascertained the form of that planet to be that of a cube with its angles and edges truncated, which he ascribes to the action of the belt.

The following method will preserve wood in damp situations. Take 12lbs. of resin beat in a mortar, 3lbs. of sulphur, and 12 pints of whale-oil; let them be melted together over a fire: ochra-powder may be added, to give the mixture a proper colour. Two coats are to be applied, after which the wood will not be subject to injury by humidity. The first coat should be laid on lightly, having been previously heated; the second, after an interval of two or three days; a third may be added, if from the peculiarity of the situation it be judged expedient.

The late Mr. RAMSDEN invented an instrument, by which a chasing ship can ascertain whether she gains or loses in pursuit of another vessel. It consists in applying a micrometer to a refracting telescope of about two feet long, or to a day

and night telescope. To this combination the English Sailors have given the characteristic name of a *Coming-up Glass*; and it is said completely to answer its purpose. A description of it may be seen in the Philosophical Magazine, Vol. XXII. pp. 319—321, drawn up by the present maker, a pupil of Mr. Ramsden's.

LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THEOLOGY.

Vol. II. of the Whole Works of Bishop Hall; to be completed in Ten Volumes, 8vo. demy, 8s. per Vol. Whatman's royal, 12s.

A brief Treatise on Death; Philosophically, Morally, and Practically considered. By Robert Fellowes, A. M. Foolscap 8vo. 3s.

An Essay towards a connected Elucidation of the prophetical Part of the Apocalypse, compiled with the Help of some original Communications, by M. St. Morrell. 8vo. 3s.

A second Warning to Christian Professors, occasioned by some Passages in the first, containing injurious Reflections on Protestant Dissenters; in Five Letters to the Rev. R. Hill, M. A. 12mo. 1s.

Notes on all the Books of the Old and New Testament; for the Use of the Pulpit and private Families. By the Rev. Dr. J. Priestley. 4 vols. 8vo. £1s. 16s.

Index to the Bible; in which the various Subjects occurring in the Scriptures are alphabetically arranged, with accurate References. By Dr. Priestley. 12mo. 5s.

A Defence of the Christian Doctrines of the Society of Friends against the Charge of Socinianism, and its Church Discipline vindicated; in Answer to a Writer who stiles himself *Verax*. By J. Bevans, jun. 8vo. 5s. 6d.

The Progress of Christianity, (historical and chronological) from its Promulgation at Jerusalem, to its legal Establishment under Constantine: also, a Sketch of the primitive Christian Church. With Notes, geographical and critical. By T. Wood. 5s. fine paper, with Map, 7s.

The Doctrines of Heathen Philosophy compared with those of Revelation. To which is prefixed, Socrates and Jesus compared. 8vo. 4s.

A Key to the Apostolic Writings, by John Taylor, D. D. abridged; with a Preliminary Dissertation on the Scriptures of the New Testament. By T. Howe. 12mo. 3s. 6d.

A Sermon preached in Holywood Church, May 12, 1805, on Occasion of the Death of the late Rev. Bryan Johnstone, D. D. By the Rev. John Johnstone. 1s.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Fourth Volume of the Life of General Washington. 4to. £1s. 11s. 6d. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

History of all the Events and Transactions in India, containing all the Negotiations of the British Government relative to the glorious Success of the late Wars. 4to. 10s. 6d. l. p. 15s.

A few Thoughts on the Creation, Generation, Growth, and Evolution, of the Human Body and Soul; on the spiritual and immortal Nature of the Soul of Man, and on the Resurrection of the Body in a spiritual, incorruptible, and glorified State. 3s. 6d. sewed.

The Names and Descriptions of the Proprietors of unclaimed Dividends on the Public Funds, which became due on or before the 10th of October, 1804, and remained unpaid the 29th of June, 1805. Parts I. and II. 2s. 6d. each.

An Essay on the Construction of the Sails of Ships and Vessels, with Plans and Descriptions of the Patent Sails. By Malcolm Bowan, R. N. 4to. 4s. 6d.

Outline of a Plan for reducing the Poor's Rate, and amending the Condition of the Aged and Unfortunate; including those of the naval and military Departments: in a Letter to the Right Hon. G. Rose, occasioned by his Observations on the Poor Laws, &c. By John Bone. 8vo. 2s.

☞ *We are obliged to postpone till next Month the* Foreign Literary Intelligence, *and also the* Religious Intelligence, *the Room which these would have occupied being taken up by the Reflections, which follow, on the State of Public Affairs.*

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

REFLECTIONS ON THE PRESENT CRISIS.

The situation of our country at this moment cannot but appear to every eye peculiarly interesting. During a long course of years, with only a short and feverish interval, we have been engaged in war with that great and

powerful State which we are accustomed to call our *natural enemy;* often, it is to be feared, too little recollecting, when we have used the phrase, what a reproach it casts on nations professedly Christian, that, in their common language, neighbour and enemy should in effect have become convertible terms. Our counsels have been directed by men of acknowledged talents and patriotism; our soldiers and sailors have fought with a gallantry equal to all that we find recorded in the page of history; and God has repeatedly blessed our arms with signal victories: yet our great enemy has been all along gradually advancing in resources, extent of dominion, and power. Though occasionally and partially checked, he has soon regained, and even overpassed, his former boundaries, and has mocked the vain hopes of those who have too sanguinely presumed on his temporary defeats*; like the advancing tide, which, gradually perhaps, but surely, effects its destined progress, while a spectator, who should have taken a transient view at one particular moment, might have seen a retiring wave, and have vainly inferred that the sea itself was receding. But at the very moment when our ambitious enemy appeared to have completed his preparations—when, through the indefatigable efforts of his energetic government (for let us not conceal from ourselves its real character,) the remnant of the former navies of France, which had been so long confined within their harbours by our superior strength, having been powerfully reinforced by the creation of a new marine; and his fleets, having been combined with those of Spain, appeared in the European Seas in numbers superior to our own, and only inferior in force from the unrivalled skill and valour of our sailors long accustomed to brave the utmost fury of the elements:—just in these very circumstances, when all appearances indicated that we were on the very eve of the long expected contest, which, whatever might be its issue, must be acknowledged to be perilous and critical almost without example, involving not the prosperity only, but the independence, and even the very existence, of the British Empire: at this very crisis, the forces of our enemy were called away to distant enterprizes, and all the evils and dangers of invasion are for the present at an end. We learn also, that the inordinate ambition of the present ruler of France has at length produced the natural effect of rousing the tardy spirit of resistance, in some others of the great European powers.

What then are the sentiments and feelings which the present state of things ought to excite in the mind of a Christian Observer? Surely, in the first place, sensations of lively gratitude towards the Almighty, for having averted a contest, in which, if at least the enemy had effected a landing on our shores, though our arms might have been finally crowned with a decided and glorious victory, there must have been an effusion of blood, a loss of the substance of the political body, if it may be so expressed, and an amount of wretchedness among survivors, far greater than in common wars, on account of the peculiar composition of our military force; which, instead of consisting of its usual materials, would have contained a large proportion of the most valuable part of the community. From all these evils and hazards we are for a time at least exempted, and therefore all who look through second causes to the great ordainer of all human events, will recognize, in these occurrences, a fresh instance of that divine goodness which this country has so often and so eminently experienced.

But a real, at least a watchful, Christian, will not be satisfied with those short-lived emotions of gratitude which pass away almost as soon as they begin to exist, and exhaust themselves in the transient risings of a natural affection. Such passing sensations of thankfulness as these, then, over whom Religion has very little permanent power, often experience, especially when they are in good health and spirits, and have a temper naturally warm and affectionate. The true Christian remembers the scriptural caution, so exactly the reverse of that which we should be ready to expect, were we to listen to those who deny the doctrine of human depravity; "Beware lest thou forget God"—when?

* Witness especially the confident hopes which were entertained on Suwarrow's victories, and their fatal disappointment.

When from the discontinuance of their blessings and enjoyments, God might seem, to the mercenary and selfish, almost to have deserted them? No. But beware lest thou forget God, when thou hast eaten and art full, when thy barns are filled with plenty and thine arms are crowned with victory. This the real Christian bears in mind, and the conclusions it suggests agree but too exactly with the result of his own experience; for he is deeply impressed with a sense of the natural corruption of his own heart, and of his consequent proneness to seek after God only when he is in want of his favours, and to think no more of him when they are obtained. He is likewise aware that all the dispensations of Providence may, and therefore ought to be rendered the means of producing on his own heart those holy affections, and of perfecting that blessed frame of mind, which are "to make him meet to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light," by rendering a temper of piety and humility, love, gratitude, and confidence, the ruling and habitual temper of his soul. He, therefore, who, with such an end in view as this, watches the descent of all the mercies of heaven, will review with deliberation the whole course of past occurrences, that no circumstance, to which attention is really due, may escape his observation; and will endeavour to improve a fugitive emotion into a settled principle of gratitude. He will be particularly on his guard against the disposition which he sees to be very common among those who are not led by a splenetic temper, or a spirit of party hostility, to underrate and disparage the counsels and resources of our allies,—a disposition to run into the contrary extreme, and to depend too confidently on the numbers and force of the new confederacy. A Christian learns in the school of Christ that sense of the short-sightedness of man, and of the uncertainty of all human projects; that moderation also in his expectations from all human things, which much and bitter experience is too often insufficient to produce in men of the world: and since he scarcely dares to flatter himself, that our past national dangers and sufferings (how trifling have been the latter compared with what they must have become, had our country been the seat of war!) have produced that national reformation, and amendment of our ways, which might reasonably suggest a humble hope, that the divine chastisements, having effected their salutary purpose, were now at an end; he cannot but feel something of a fear, lest our punishment should only be suspended, not remitted; lest the same providential instrument should again be employed to chastise us; and lest our inveterate enemy should possibly again be permitted to threaten our shores, after having been again victorious over his continental enemies. In truth, when we look back into the history of confederacies in all ages and countries, and see how little the hopes have been realised which were at first formed from the effects of their accumulated force; when we even call to mind that we commenced the last war in combination with almost all the powers of Europe; but when we remember how little they appeared to forget their individual interests, and prejudices, and passions, in the common cause, and, (as the too natural consequence of these discordancies,) that before many years had passed away, some of our allies were neutralized, some even gone over to our enemies, and all, at length, subdued into submission:—we are surely reminded not to be too sanguine in our expectations from this new confederacy. True wisdom, therefore; that wisdom which is the result of experience, as well as Christian piety, teaches us to regard the present political state of the Continent with moderation and sobriety, as that which, through the goodness of Providence, may be rendered the means of tranquillizing Europe, by weakening the power and humbling the arrogance of France: but if the issue should be of a directly opposite kind, however contrary it would be to our earnest wishes, it would not disappoint any very sanguine hopes. But though Great Britain is not about to be the seat of war, and though the immense armies which are rushing forward to the combat consist not of our own countrymen, He would ill deserve the name of Christian Observer, whose heart had not been so far enlarged and softened by that Religion of which the vital principle is love, as to make him deeply commiserate such an enormous sum of miseries as that with which any of our fellow creatures are

about to be afflicted. How many thousands are about to be hurried, unprepared, into eternity; over how large a field will the desolations of war be extended. In the contemplation of such a scene even philosophy is forced to declaim against the littleness of ambition, and the folly of man. But Christianity takes a deeper and a juster view. She sees a too lively exemplification of those important truths, which, however let down by the simplicity of scriptural language, (see James iii.) to the level of the uninstructed understanding, are most truly deserving the name of wisdom:—that the evils and miseries of war are the bitter fruit of sin, and the punishment which, in the way of natural consequence, is annexed to the indulgence of pride, ambition, and all those corrupt passions, which taint the hearts and poison the happiness of men. He sickens at the sight of this extended field of guilt and misery, and tired of such a world, he longs the more earnestly for that better country in which peace and love will be perfect in degree, and eternal in duration. But the true Christian will also be careful not to relax in the earnestness of his supplications, because his country is relieved from the immediate pressure of danger. Still bearing in mind the uncertainty of all human things, and that all events are under the divine guidance; that national misfortunes are the inflictions of a divine sentence, but that God is gracious and merciful, long suffering, and of great goodness, a God who expressly represents himself as hearing the prayers of his people, and as often withholding, on their intercession, and for their sakes, the punishments which the countries to which they belong have justly merited: conscious also that every conjuncture has its appropriate services, he now endeavours to be as earnest in the closet as, if the enemy had landed on our shores, he would have felt it his duty to be active in the field. In that case he would have exerted his utmost powers in repelling the attack; and in animating his countrymen with the ardour and energy the times would have required, ever looking to the Almighty for support and success, and abounding in acts of supplication which, however frequent and fervent, would necessarily have been shorter and less particular than in circumstances of greater leisure. But now he proposes to set himself to the work of prayer more deliberately. Looking into the Word of God, his standing counsellor, he finds that, in all times of national exigence, a good patriot is peculiarly called on, by acts of penitential humiliation and earnest prayer, to moderate the chastisement, perhaps to deprecate the displeasure, and conciliate the favour, of heaven. He will, therefore, so far as the circumstances of his station will admit of it, think it right, after the example of holy men of ancient times recorded in Scripture, to set apart a day for the special purpose of humiliation and intercession. In national, as well as individual concerns, "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." Our Christian Observer will, therefore, be more than commonly earnest in his prayers for the Divine protection and favour; and he will also strive to produce, in the minds of all around him, an increased sense of the power and government of God, and of our constant dependance on him for all our enjoyments; well knowing that there is nothing more justly provoking to God, or which more commonly draws down the Divine vengeance, than insensibility to the goodness of the Almighty, and a proud and self-sufficient spirit of independence. Thus the true Christian will stand in the breach and labour in his country's cause; maintaining meanwhile that holy composure of spirit which all courage, which rests merely on a human basis, can but imperfectly imitate. He waits not for the arrival of the foreign mail with feverish anxiety. Whatever tidings it may bring, whatever may be the issue of the continental war, he is collected and cheerful. His calmness, however, is not the result of apathy, or of indifference to his country's welfare: for that he is warmly interested: his composure arises from his consciousness, that let the event be what it will, it is the ordination of his heavenly Father, in all whose disposals he has learned to acquiesce with humble complacency and confidence. It is, we trust, no false persuasion with which we are impressed, that our country contains multitudes who are thus living a life of faith, and prayer, and piety. May that number be increased. They are a possession of which we shall one

day better know, and more highly appreciate, the value. Their prayers may, perhaps, be the means of continuing to us the national blessings we have so long enjoyed: at all events they will deliver their own souls; and, if the hour of domestic havoc and desolation should at length arrive, even then, as the Word of God informs us, they who have "sighed and cried" will not be forgotten: they will be supported under all the trials from which Divine Providence may not see it fit to exempt them, and their transitory sufferings will soon be succeeded "by those pleasures which are at God's right hand for ever more."

CONTINENTAL INTELLIGENCE.

A variety of diplomatic papers has been submitted to the view of the public during the present month, from which much important information is to be collected respecting the spirit and intentions both of FRANCE, and of those powers which are allied against her. The latter have made out a very strong case. They have displayed in the eyes of Europe their own moderation and forbearance, while they have demonstrated, what is also sufficiently apparent in every paper which has proceeded from the bureau of the French minister for foreign affairs, the inordinate ambition, the hypocrisy, the treachery, the insolence, and the despotism, of the present ruler of France. It was with no small pleasure that, at the close of a paper transmitted from Vienna to Paris, on the 3d of September, and which enumerated the causes of complaint against France, we read the following formal declaration on the part of Austria and Russia, viz.

"That they are ready to enter into a negotiation with France, for maintaining the peace of the Continent on the most moderate terms which are compatible with the general tranquillity and security:

"That, whatever shall be the issue of the negotiations, and even should the commencement of hostilities become unavoidable, they, at the same time, pledge themselves to abstain from every proceeding tending to interfere with the internal concerns of France; or to alter the state of possession, and the legally existing relations in the German Empire, or, in the slightest degree, to injure the rights or interests of the Ottoman Porte, the integrity of whose dominions they are, on the contrary, prepared to defend to the utmost of their power:

"Finally, that the sentiments of Great Britain are conformable with those herein expressed, and that she has displayed the same moderate disposition for the restoration of peace between her and France."

The answer made by Bonaparte to this paper took away all hope of accommodation; for he insisted, as a preliminary to any negotiation, that Austria should relinquish every military advantage which she enjoyed from her forward state of preparation; and he added, that if Austria refused, he would compel her to it by force of arms. This menace Bonaparte has proceeded to execute with his characteristic promptitude and vigour. He has marched his armies from Hanover, Holland, and the coasts of the ocean, into the heart of Germany, with an unexampled rapidity. In his course he has wholly disregarded the obstacles interposed by the neutrality of intervening states, and has even violated the territory of Prussia. And by a military manœuvre, of so daring and hazardous a kind, as must have rendered useless all the previous calculations of his enemies, he has placed himself between the Austrian armies and Vienna, in the hope of striking a decisive blow before the Russian forces can reach the scene of action. In the execution of this plan some partial rencontres have taken place between bodies of French and Austrian troops, in one of which it is stated by the French, though probably with some exaggeration, that about 5000 Austrians were made prisoners.

The relative position of the hostile armies was, by the last accounts (Oct. 10th) as follows. The head quarters of the Austrians, whose force is stated to be 84,000 men, are at Ulm, whence their line extends South towards Memingen; while the head quarters of the French, who are said to have pushed no less than 140,000 men across the Danube at Donawert, Neuburg, and Ingolstat, were at Augsburgh, in the rear of the Austrians, a part of their line extending even to Munich. Bonaparte himself commanded the main body. The first division of the Russian army had entered Braunaw (a place on the Inn, about 65 miles East of Munich), and was advancing to effect a junction with the Austrians, which was now, however, rendered almost impracticable by the position of the French. It was expected that Bonaparte would lose no time in making a general attack on the Austrian line, before the Russians should have it in their power to molest his rear; and the critical situation in which his failure in such an attack would place him, will probably induce him to put forth his whole strength and energy on the occasion*. It is manifest, that if the Austrians should be able so far to resist his attacks, as to maintain their present position till the

* The ground occupied by the French is the same to which the Duke of Marlborough carried his army from the Lower Rhine, and where the battle of Hochstet, or Blenheim, was fought.

Russians shall begin to press on the rear of the French army, its situation will be perilous in the extreme. It cannot be dissembled, however, that there is considerable ground for apprehending a less favourable issue, and that the Austrian army in Swabia is exposed to the utmost danger.

In ITALY no blow has yet been struck. The adverse armies, under the command of the Archduke Charles, and Massena, line the opposite banks of the Adige, and probably await the issue of the first general battle which may be fought in Swabia.

The violation of the territory of PRUSSIA by the French troops from Hanover and Holland is likely to lead to very important results. Much indignation has been felt, and even expressed, by the Court of Berlin, on account of this outrage, and permission has, in consequence of it, been granted to the Russian troops to march through the Prussian territory. Whether what has passed will induce the King of Prussia to join the confederacy is doubtful; but it has now clearly become his interest to do so, as Bonaparte will not fail to retain a lively recollection of the present insult, and to seek a convenient opportunity of revenge. Indeed the conduct of Prussia has manifested several strong indications of a disposition hostile to France. As one proof of this, on the 25th inst. the Prussian Consul notified at Lloyd's, that he was authorized to warn all masters of Prussian Ships against entering the Ports of France and Holland, as thereby their vessels might be brought into danger.

The Elector of BAVARIA, after having excited a general expectation that he would join his arms to those of Austria, in order to deliver the civilized world from the tyranny of Bonaparte, has united his troops, amounting it is said to 30,000 men, to those of France. The Margrave of BADEN, and the Duke of WURTEMBERG have been under the necessity of furnishing contingents in aid of the same cause, on the ground of secret treaties which they had, no doubt, been forced to subscribe. In the course of his journey to join his army, Bonaparte subjected our late Princess Royal, the Duchess of Wurtemberg, to the humiliation of entertaining him and his suite in the Ducal palace.

The Diet of SWITZERLAND has unanimously declared its resolution to maintain by arms the neutrality and inviolability of its territory. This resolution will probably be kept just as long as it may suit the convenience of Bonaparte.

We turn our eyes now from the south to the north of Germany. About 20,000 Russians have landed at Stralsund, together with a considerable body of Swedes, and more are daily expected. The destination of this force is probably, in the first instance, to deliver Hanover from the French troops which still remain there, and which, it is said, are strongly fortifying the fortress of Hameln, where they mean to make a stand; and afterwards in concert perhaps with an army from England, to attempt the emancipation of Holland. The circumstance of Prussia having quietly permitted these movements is favourable to the hopes of the allies.

RUSSIA is making great exertions. Besides the armies of 100,000 men which have ere this reached the scene of action, a force of 300,000 men is said to be in readiness as a reserve, and a farther levy has been ordered of four recruits from every 500 souls in the whole extent of the empire. Immense levies are also making on the part of Austria. The Emperor of Russia has proceeded to join his armies in Bavaria. The King of SWEDEN it is said will command in person the allied army in Pomerania.

The King of NAPLES, it is affirmed, has agreed that both that kingdom and Sicily shall be occupied by a body of English and Russian troops, which are to be drawn from Malta and Corfu for that purpose.

From SPAIN, accounts are received of a great tumult having been caused at Madrid, by the attempt forcibly to circulate, as cash, some paper money which had fallen into such discredit as to be generally refused in payment. The troops were called out and many people killed and wounded before tranquillity was restored. Some of the grandees implicated in the transaction have been banished.

EAST INDIES.

On the 18th of April peace was concluded between the Rajah of Bhuttpore and Lord Lake, on the following terms, viz. that the fort of Deeg with its territory should be surrendered to the British; that the Rajah should pay 20 lacks of rupees; and that his eldest son should be delivered up as a hostage. The fortress of Bhurtpore of course remains in possession of the Rajah. Previous to this event several actions had taken place near Bhurtpore, in which the British forces were uniformly victorious. Holkar is said to be reduced to the greatest distress, and his force to be nearly destroyed.

GREAT BRITAIN.

DOMESTIC INTELLIGENCE.

PARLIAMENT stands prorogued to the 28th of November, and it is supposed will be still farther prorogued till after Christmas.

The blockade of the Elbe and the Wezer has been withdrawn, to the great relief of commerce, in consequence of the French having evacuated the banks of these rivers.

Lord Harrowby, has proceeded to Berlin on a mission of the very first importance.

NAVAL INTELLIGENCE.

A Russian squadron, consisting of five sail of the line and a frigate, has arrived at

Portsmouth, and another is shortly expected. They are destined to the Mediterranean.

A French squadron, supposed from Rochfort, consisting of five sail of the line and two frigates, appears to have cruised for some time in the chops of the Channel, and after eluding various detachments which were sent in quest of it, and doing very material injury to our commerce, to have made good its retreat into Ferrol, with some valuable prizes. On the 25th of September this squadron fell in with a convoy from St. Helena, under charge of the Calcutta 50 gun ship. The convoy escaped owing to the gallant conduct of Captain Woodriffe and the crew of the Calcutta, who kept the whole fleet of the enemy at bay, till the ships under her care had dispersed. The Calcutta was at length obliged to yield to a force so very disproportionate, and to strike her flag. A part of the outward bound Lisbon and Oporto fleets has been captured by the same squadron.

The Leeward Island and Jamaica fleets have arrived in this country. Seven sail have been lost; eight are still missing; and two have fallen into the enemy's hands, and not been recaptured. The two fleets contained 302 sail.

DEATHS.

At Shapinshay, one of the Orkney Islands, in the 57th year of his age, the Rev. Dr. George Barry, minister of that parish. He had just published a history of the 67 Islands of Orkney, the fruit of many years laborious research. He has left behind him a widow and nine children.

Sept. 24. At Hoy, in the Orkneys, Mrs. Hamilton, wife of the Rev. G. Hamilton. She has left a husband and five young children to deplore the loss of a truly christian wife and mother.

Aged 76, the Rev. John Lake, rector of Lanivet, co. Cornwall.

At Bengworth, co. Worcester, the Rev. J. Beale, M. A. curate of that chapel.

In his 26th year, the Rev. Theodore Henry Dixon Hoste, fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Rev. Charles Warre, of Rugby, late of Sidney College, Cambridge.

Aug. 12. Found drowned in the river Lune, the Rev. Thomas Holden, rector of Halsall, near Ormskirk. On the Coroner's Inquest it appeared that he had been in a desponding way for some time, and it was supposed that in a desperate state he had thrown himself into the river.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

J. F.'s contributions will probably find a place; as will those of O.; and D. W. No. III. of *Clerical Characteristics* in our next. We shall always be glad to receive J. O.'s communications. O. C. K. will find a Letter at the Publisher's. R. F.; Candidus; J. B. S.; J. S. N.; and Philoprepon, are received. Thomas Hervey's Letter; Boethos; Discipulus; and A Christian Parent, are under consideration.

We feel no material objection to what J. F. G. has done. He ought certainly, however, to have acknowledged the source of his Tract.

We have found it difficult to discover whether Timotheus be serious in what he says respecting the Letter of *Peter O'Leary*, in the Number for August. The most superficial reader, we should have imagined, must have seen that the drift of it was to shew the danger of indulging in that fanciful mode of interpreting Scripture, which is now too prevalent even among pious clergymen; there being no limit which can be put to the freaks of imagination, when it is once allowed to transgress the bounds of scriptural truth and soberness, and to spurn the trammels of reason and evidence.

In reply to the Letter with which we have been honoured by Dr. Law, we beg leave to observe, that he has entirely mistaken our meaning, in attributing to us any intention of charging him with infidelity. We wholly disclaim any such intention, nor can we discover the smallest ground for imputing it to us in the passage referred to by Dr. Law. See our Number for August, p. 501, col. 2, line 39, &c.

ERRATA.

In the present Number, p. 584, col. 1, line 14, for *Passor* read *Pasor*.
col. 2, line 20, from bottom, after Rom. iv. 25. add "δια την δικαιωσιν ήμων."
p. 600, col. 2, line 8, from bottom, for *sweetings* read *sweetness*.
p. 609, col. 2, line 7, from bottom, ought to have been marked as the end of the quotation.